No. 3565.190
Sur. A.
Pa.1-8, 11-12

GIVEN BY
Francis W. Lee

3565.190

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

s A. No. 1.} APRIL 1, 1895. {PER ANNUM, $2.00. SINGLE NUMBERS, 10c.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.

BY THE

REV. ROBERT A. HOLLAND, S. T. D.

CAMBRIDGE.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

3 MASON STREET.

1895.

2719

Francis W. Lee
Mar. 20, 1895.

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

OBJECTS. — 1. To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. 2. To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time. 3. To present CHRIST in practical life as the living Master and King, the Enemy of wrong and selfishness, the Power of righteousness and love.

MEMBERSHIP (entitling to Publications) is open to all communicants of the Episcopal Church upon application to the Secretary and the payment of one dollar.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to the Publications are received from non-members at two dollars per annum.

PRESIDENT.

The Rt. Rev. F. D. HUNTINGTON, S. T. D.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

The Rt. Rev. HENRY C. POTTER, D. D.
The Rev. JOSEPH REYNOLDS.
The Rev. ROBERT A. HOLLAND, S. T. D.
Prof. RICHARD T. ELY, Ph. D.
GEORGE E. MCNEIL.

SECRETARY.

The Rev. GEORGE HODGES, D. D., 3 Mason Street, Cambridge, Mass.

TREASURER.

ROBERT H. GARDINER, 40 State Street, Boston, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Rev. J. W. SUTER, *Chairman.*

Prof. W. J. ASHLEY, M. A.
EDMUND BILLINGS.
The Rev. W. D. P. BLISS.
The Rev. C. H. BRENT.
The Rev. W. L. BULL.
The Rev. W. B. FRISBY.
FRANCIS WATTS LEE.
The Rev. PHILO W. SPRAGUE.
The Rev. FLOYD TOMPKINS, Jr.
JOHN W. WOOD.

COUNCIL.

The foregoing and
The Rt. Rev. H. M. THOMPSON, S. T. D.
The Rt. Rev. DAVIS SESSUMS, D. D.
The Rev. ARTHUR BROOKS, D. D.
Prof. JAMES H. DILLARD.
Miss HELENA S. DUDLEY.
The Rev. Prof. E. P. GOULD, D. D.
The Rev. PERCY S. GRANT.
JAMES L. HOUGHTELING.
WILLIAM P. JOHNSTON, LL. D.
The Rev. J. S. LINDSAY, D. D.
The Rev. ARTHUR LOWNDES.
J. BLEEKER MILLER.
The Rev. HENRY MOTTET, D. D.
The Rev. H. N. POTTER, D. D.
The Rev. W. S. RAINSFORD, D. D.
Miss VIDA D. SCUDDER.
ARCHIBALD L. SESSIONS.
The Rev. H. H. SLEEPER, Ph. D.
The Rev. WILLIAM HARMAN VAN ALLEN.
The Rev. GEORGE R. VAN DE WATER, D. D.
EVERETT P. WHEELER.
The Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS.
GEORGE ZABRISKIE.

Notes for Members on Last Page.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.

BY THE REV. R. A. HOLLAND, D. D.

THE Church Social Union is a body of Churchmen devoted to the study of social problems. Among the many guilds and brotherhoods of the Church it is peculiar in having no definite scheme of action. It believes that action is often untimely and wasteful through lack of knowledge, and that in the presence of new and strange conditions, time may be saved and power gained by a patient, cautious, thorough examination alike of social ills and of the remedies proposed to relieve them. Individually its members may entertain what theories they please and do what they list to put such theories into practice, but as a union they have no other aim than the knowledge which brings wisdom. And while this aim seems over-academic and vague, especially to us Americans whose quick thought jumps to instant act, and has scarcely any other way of proving its truth than by success of action, yet when we consider how likely such thinking is to be crude and such conduct rash, how difficult is the repair of a foolish deed once done, and how much influence the doer and his good intentions lose by the folly; above all, when we consider that the Church herself is represented by her priests and is charged with their blunders, and may be thus robbed of the confidence of men, which is her opportunity to help them with a sure and divine relief,—when we consider these things, the consecration of earnest minds to study may appear quite practical enough to commend itself even to our fidgety American habits, with their tiresome glorification of "hustle."

But the studies of the Church Social Union are not altogether vague. They have a certain distinction that marks them as noteworthy in the present attitude of the Church

towards the great secular world which many claim to be an outside and entirely foreign realm. For it is the world's so-called secularities that these students are bent upon knowing, — its industry, trade, government; why after centuries of civilization there remains so much poverty, ignorance, vice, wretchedness, tyranny of class, oppression of circumstance, tumult, desperation preferring anarchy to the existent order, wide-spread madness that would wreck the world itself as a huge curse upon the souls thrown by cruel birth into its pain and wrong.

Nor is this study of secularities merely curious. They have cried out against the Church for standing aloof while they weltered in a confusion which, in spite of its noise about progress, grew more and more confused. True, they drove the Church off, and bade her stay apart, with crossed arms, and look upcast to the sky, contemplating the pale-faced virtues of a far-away heaven, while they made their own robust sort of heaven on earth. The Church meant divine law, the law of laws, an institution above all other institutions, and they would be subject to no such spiritual despotism — "Away with her!" The State caught up the clamor, wishing to take the Church's place, and shouted, "Away with her!" But the State being only another Church just as supreme, just as despotic, men would not brook its control and demanded that it too should depart and let them alone. "*Laissez faire.*" Hands off! The less government the better; no government best of all! Liberty — they wanted liberty, liberty of unrestrained competition for place, money, pleasure, power.

In some parts of the earth they got it and got anything but their dream. It proved bondage worse than serfdom — the wolf's right to eat up sheep, and the sheep's right to be fairly and peacefully devoured. And now they are begging the State — multitudes of them — to become a great household and take them all into its keeping, and order their fortunes more evenly. And the Church they blame with the ills that followed her banishment from secular life. Why did she go? Why did she not stand by the wilful ones, and bear with their upbraidings? Is she not inspired to know her duty? Does she have to be elected by plebiscite, the Church of the World? Can she be the Church of the World and give the world up to a hostile power? If

the world had a real Church, a Church of the righteous God, a Church of the pitiful Christ, would the poor world writhe as it does under the devil's heel? Those eyes upcast to the sky,— let them look down and show what divine light is in them as they see the world's want? Those crossed arms, — let them open, and reach out, and pour oil and balm, and take hold of the stripped and bruised and wounded body of Mankind and bear it away to some Inn of Healing. Else the very sight of the Church in silk attire and ritual decorum and palaces of worship is a cold-hearted mockery of human woes.

The reproach comes not only from dens of sin; the homes of honest workmen utter it; sincere and anxious thinkers publish it with plausible argument; it is echoed in clubs, in colleges, in all sorts of conventions; it fills the air of public thought, and sounds within the sanctuary itself, and flies round and round the Altar of Sacrifice, and there, worshippers have heard it mingling with their sacrificial prayers — this wail of the outside of the world — and have felt that, though false, it had truth in its falsehood, too much truth to be put aside as wild blasphemy. There was deep want in the wail, — want as for the very Altar's Christ, sought elsewhere under other names, and not found by souls more than ever hungry and footsore for their long, vain search. And the worshippers have risen from their knees, saying: "We will go to that sick World and learn for ourselves its malady, touch it, watch by it, lay our ear over its heart and listen to its beatings, hear it talk in fevered sleep." Labor — is there reason in its outcry? Capital — what are its shortcomings and abuses, and how may wealth be turned into welfare? The Classes — should there be any classes? and, if so, by what right principle of classification? Poverty and Crime — must these foul sores of society always fester and run? The State — what is the State? what constitutes its right to rule, and the obligation of the people to obey? Is it a mere police of private interests, a necessary evil whose evil nature taints everything that belongs to it, so that politics must likewise be necessarily evil, and politicians corrupt — the unclean scavengers of society? Or is the State something sacred, and to be reverenced as an ordinance of God, the sword-bearing right hand of God's justice in the world?

Such are the problems which the Church Social Union has set itself to study, and such is the spirit of its studies. More, its members of diverse thought have a common clue of research in believing the Incarnation to be somehow the solution of all social problems, the one dominant principle of economics and politics as well as of ethics and religion. For, in the Incarnation, as they understand it, God has become not only a man, but MAN; and MAN means all that Man thinks, desires, does, the whole scope and form of his Humanity.

A divine individual who lived two thousand years ago and died and went out of sight, leaving behind never so fair and potent a memory would have been an avatar, not an Incarnation. The acorn is not simply a nut, but the nut in all the oak phases that unfold and manifest its nature; so man is not simply individual but the entire human world which discloses the inmost substance of his individuality. Man is the family, the state, the race. Man is labor and trade and property and capital and war and invention and science and literature and art and religion. Take these social forms away, and social speech whereby they exist, and what is left for the individual? He has no laws, no exchanges, no rights except those his own little hand can pluck and hold against all comers, no language whereby to learn other men's thought, no past of transmitted knowledge, no future of growth or progress. He stands utterly alone. He is an irremediable savage. He begins life as if life began with him, that is, provided he can get born without the social institution called the family. Absolute individual means absolute idiot, worse still, absolute nonentity. No such minimum or zero of manhood did God become in Christ; but Man the Family, Man the State, Man the Race, whose instituted form is the Church.

Nay, since the individual is the product of these institutions, Christ could not be the standard of individual perfection without being their standard likewise. To be less were to be a torso or deformity.

As, then, the Incarnation is social and includes all society, there must be a Christ of the home, a Christ of the workshop, a Christ of the market, a Christ of the forum, a Christ of the chisel, the brush, the pen. He is King of the whole world, or a vagabond. A fenced-out God is no God. Cer-

tainly the God-Man cannot consent to be shut out of any part of His own Manhood, even though enclosed in a Church lofty and grand as a citadel where His courtiers might hold ceremonial levees, or strut round the parapets with an air of foppish soldiery, while the vast outside world owned another sway.

Admit that "business is business" and "politics politics," in any sense that does not subordinate them to religion and make religion their very spine, and religion itself is nerveless. As soon as a social question ceases to be speculative and grows urgent, arraying minds for the strife that is to decide laws of conduct — at that instant when the question in becoming ethical becomes also political — religion has to step back and play indifferent, or at least, mute spectator. For politics (I mean American politics) resents the intrusion of Christ or any power that bears His name. When temperance gets popular strength enough to force a vote on high license, the Church must stop denouncing the abominations of the liquor traffic. Should opposition to divorce laws ever resort to the ballot, the Church, which up to that time might lead the attack, would have to quit the field just before the shock of onset. Let a State charter a lottery to prey like a cancer on its moral no less than on its industrial life, and forthwith lotteries are a political enterprise which the Church must not meddle with. If politics themselves grow feculent, and suffrage be debauched, and the ballot falsified, and the popular will throttled while the will of conspirators takes its voice and commands a nation in its name, still the Church must never hint which party is guilty, or the guiltier of this high treason against elective government.

Can the Church of the Incarnation accept any such definition of spheres as this which keeps all real speech, real influence and power to the State with politicians for its priests, and leaves to the Church a little mountain-top, up-in-the-air citadel where she may feel impregnable, just so long as she stays within gates, and sings contentedly of "The Sweet Bye and Bye"?

Consider what must happen in that case to both Church and State. As to the State. However men may theorize about it, the State is, within its territorial bounds, omnipotent. The people may claim certain liberties as theirs by natural

right, but the State determines how far they shall exercise them. Existing for the public good, it defines, and may falsely define, the good it exists for. Its laws measure the rightful and just, and thus raise or lower the standard of public morality. It inflicts whatever penalty it wishes. It fines, imprisons, banishes, kills. It claims to be and is the source of all property, grants, confiscates, prescribes conditions of tenure, and how property is to be obtained, transmitted, inherited, devised. It can tax without restraint and create or destroy values by controlling the currency. It declares war with other nations. It suppresses rebellion at any cost of money or men. Most important of all, it rules social relations, ordaining what constitutes marriage and what may cause divorce, whether marriage shall be bound by Heaven's law of life-long fidelity, or left as loose as bestial lust; whether, indeed, home shall be a nursery of virtue or the hotbed of vice.

True, a constitutional government is limited by its fundamental law, but that law is fixed and can be unfixed by the will of the people, who are neither much worse nor much better than the government that represents them. At any rate, in being responsible to the people, the State is simply responsible to its own less ordered, less stable, and more capricious will, and not to any higher will or law. Is there any higher law? That is the question. Has the State as a State any God? Is the man it contemplates its creature and subject, or truly sovereign because divine, — the God-Man? And if it own no such Man, no such God, no such higher Will, nothing above its own force and pleasure, what differences it from "formalized lynch law with a continent instead of a county for its theatre"?

Teach this doctrine of national irresponsibility in your schools, publish it in your newspapers, bring up generation after generation to believe it until it soaks through the common mind and becomes a tradition, a habit, a bias of thought, and how much reverence will survive for the State which itself has no reverence and acknowledges no moral obligation? Will not the very instinct of reverence decay with the loss of that sense of sanctity which can worship only where it has the vision of God? God gone, no awe, no patriotic devotion, no religious loyalty, can remain. Godless force may still be feared; but the fear will foster

cunning, and cunning will cheat the force it fears. The political trusts of such a State will be lightly held and easily betrayed. Its own enormous irresponsibility will breed an irresponsible citizenship. Evasions of jury service, perjured tax returns, bribes, jobs, embezzlements, squanderings of public treasure, will grow rife and laugh at the belated honesty that scruples to join their robber crew.

Imagine it — a power over millions of souls alive and yet to live, fating how the living shall live and the unborn shall be born, educating their characters by influences which are the matrix and atmosphere of their existence, by laws, by customs, by public opinion, by regulation of schools, of marriage, of the inmost nature of the household; imagine such an omnipotent maker of the moral standards of the race, age after age, yet itself without morality, without recognition of divine law — its own might being its only right. But might is no more reason for obedience than for disobedience. If might can blow up might with a bomb, why should it not, and by success prove itself still more right, because the mightier might? Can men glorify such a brute terrestial god, and not be imbruted in their ideal of manhood? If there be a national type whereby the American differs from the Englishman or Frenchman or German, what must be the type of manhood moulded by a nation that wants no religion in its politics, — a huge wallowing behemoth of incorporated atheism?

To say that the State is neither religious nor irreligious, but neutral, like those minor corporations which it warrants for purely secular ends, is to wrench analogy from responsible to irresponsible power. For all minor corporations are responsible to the State. The State charters them, fixes their objects and modes of action, and holds them to strict account. But who shall call the State itself to account unless God? God ignored, responsibility is ignored, and irresponsibility is atheism. Profession of indifference is confession of partisanship, and the sect it patronizes is the most aggressive, yes, the most fanatical of all modern sects, namely, infidelity, infidelity which demands, and is encouraged by its success more and more to demand, that from the nation's statutes and customs and observances, from its whole system of jurisprudence and all its inherited Christian uses shall be blotted out every rite, every holiday,

every phrase that hints of Church or Christ or God, until it becomes neutral, in fact, that is, utterly Churchless, Christless, Godless, and fairly and squarely infidel.

And if the Church agrees to this neutrality, she is as infidel as the sect that demands and the State that assumes it. She forswears her fealty, and surrenders the State and that whole ethical world which it governs, to the Prince of the Powers of the Air. She is no longer the instituted conscience of the race. She has no social empire. She does not embody a Christ whose Manhood comprises the whole scope and development of Humanity. She casts off the hope of organic influence upon the great organic forms and powers of society. She exists on sufferance. She becomes an abstraction, a shadow. Her sole reality is in the individuals who have a thought, a feeling about religion which they would foster by some ecclesiastical convenience. It is only through them individually she can act upon the world. By their separate individual faiths she may believe, in their separate individual virtues she may be good, in their staunch, upright, separate citizenship she may try to hold the State to right policy; but as a Church they form no host like the nation's army, no kingdom like the nation's realm; they are simply a pious rabble and without so much as a rabble's mass and directness of movement. In all the other phases of their manhood they act by organic principles and with organic energy, but in religion they are entirely individual and the Church is a school for the culture of this individualism to its most devout and impotent "scatteration."

Now, what must be the end of such a Church?

Having only an individual character, its aims and enterprises will be individualistic. Men being in its eyes but individuals, its schemes of salvation will be to get each of them as a soul apart out of danger; for the chief concern of every man must be, whatever betides others or the world, to save his own soul, as if he really had a distinct and private and particular article somewhere on his person that he could call *his* soul. And the growth of such a Church will be by addition. "Additions" it will proudly call its converts. Added to what? Why, to one another, of course. What else is there to add them to? Being itself a mere addition, addition must be its supreme law, and the divine

method that which adds most and fastest. Add, add, add — all its energies will go to adding. Drum up souls, fife them along, get a crowd, boast of the crowd already got, that numbers may draw numbers, — all to feel their big Oneanotherness. Popularity is the key note, popular preaching, popular singing, popular hand-shaking, and a general hurrah, to draw and draw and draw, as though Mankind were a carbuncle and the Church a poultice.

But the method must fail. The religion of popularity must at last grow unpopular. New sensations must be continually devised to take the place of old ones, for sensations soon stale, and afterwhile jaded sensibility will refuse further stimulants and turn away with disgust. Such disgust is never tabulated. It does not appear in the statistics of *additions*. On Sundays it stays at home or goes to public gardens. It sneers politely in newspapers, or gives one tenth as much space to religious intelligence as to reports of baseball, or horse races, or prize fights. It avoids religious topics in conversation. It treats religion in secular universities as an obsolescent or already antique mode of thought. It writes novels to show the pathos of dying faiths and the comedy of faiths that still promenade but only as fashions. Its extent may be reckoned by the population for whom the churches though crowded would still have no room, yet who keep no statistical account of their growing indifference.

And why should not popular indifference steadily outgrow any zeal for "addition" that has nothing to add souls to but a mere togetherness? Said an old Scotchman to a lusty young fellow who pleaded as a reason for not going to the rescue of some people caught in a flood, that he lacked faith and would be damned if drowned: "Better be damned doing the will of God than saved doing nothing." And I must confess to a sympathy with his dislike of this do-nothing salvation, this salvation that saves to no purpose but to watch itself, and pray over itself, and sing hymns about itself, and nurse and coddle itself as the pet invalid of the universe. Healthy souls prefer the fresh air of the world and their preference is sane.

The fact is, this sort of salvation has a plague-spot on its very face which ought to be heeded well before assurance becomes too sure. For genuine salvation is rescue, not

from any gripe or burn or tumble, but from sin; and the essence of sin is overweening regard of self. The soul is saved in proportion as it looks away from this private self to the divine Manhood which every man has in common with other men, their one indwelling Christ. Hence it is saved into the world, not out of the world. It sees more of the reason of the world, feels more of the world's beauty, enters more deeply into the world's good will, and so takes up the vitality of the world into its own heart and throbs with a whole world's instituted life. Its salvation is its socialization.

Reverse this mode, make it a saving of self *from* the world, with thoughts and cares all set to guard the escaped but still world-threatened self which would lay hold of the infinite power of God to pull its privacy up to a comfortable seat on His throne, and you take the Cross out of a man's character where it is the principle of enlargement and exaltation, and make it a mere external means and instrument for individual gain; in a word, you put the whole universe under the private self; and what is that but to deify the devil?

The latent immorality of such a religion must palsy its influence over the every-day life of men. Secularism, positivism, ethical culture, any theory of conduct that would save Man by delivering his thought from error, and his desire from lust, and his will from wrong, saving him by educating him in the laws of his own generic humanity, generic and therefore divine in its present truth and right and righteous joy, any such theory has more of the blood of Christ in its veins, than the most correctly creeded effort to sanctify selfishness with odors of Paradise.

Swedenborg says that when a devil goes into heaven, while he may look like an angel of light, his breathing of the angelic odors causes him to exhale his own proper and most unheavenly scent, whereby the angels recognize him and are driven far away. So amid the nearer hopes, the larger sympathies of our time, the fair-browed, sweet-voiced messenger that would save souls *out* of the world for everlasting ease and pleasure, has begun to smell!

For the life of the Church, then, no less than for the world's health, the Church Social Union pleads in asking that they be brought closer together. The world needs

the Church, the Church needs the world. The Church can be Catholic only as she is the Church of the World. She cannot get out of the world if she would, and colonize her people along the canals of Mars for a canal-boat, sort of sleepy-headed, other-worldly religion. Her people must eat and drink the world's food; speak the world's speech; do business with the world's shops, currency, wares; live and beget children, and educate their children, under the world's civil laws. She cannot save them without saving their whole social environment. For this environment is not one of things that remain outside and around them, and act on them in a mechanical way, so that they can be detached and insulated; but one of minds, subtle, pervasive, entering into motives, coloring beliefs, shaping ideals, creating like a fine and constant aura the very tissue of disposition. Now, this social environment, this social body over and about individual lives, has its great organs which, like the liver and lungs, determine the health of the lives that swim in them as corpuscles swim in the blood. And just as the physician who would purify the blood does not treat first one and then another drop, but medicates all currents at once through the organs of their flow, so the Church that would heal the vices and miseries of men, must deal with the institutions which move and mould men in the mass.

For honest commerce can help mightily to make honest merchants, and good laws to make good citizens, and gentle manners to make generous sentiments, and chaste literature to make chastity of spirit. And the Church of the World must take hold of these forces and claim them all for Christ, insisting that no law or commerce or fashion or literature is true to its own canons, which is not true to His style of Manhood; and that, instead of such maxims as, "business is business," and "politics is politics," and "art for art's sake," the one true maxim of a complete Humanity is, "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

For this royal attitude of the Church the world is calling now. It has had enough of individualism. Necessary as the revolt was at one time, when both State and Church overbore individual souls and mashed them to a common pulp, the revolt is now drying up the vital juices of society, and turning pulp to powder. Men will be free, but they

have learned that their freedom is in and by social institutions, apart from which soul is no more soul than an eye is an eye out of its socket. And if these institutions seem just now in flux, the flux will crystallize again to forms alike more solid and more prismatic with every hue of right. Thus classes are breaking up and commingling; competition is giving place to combination both in labor and capital; the State, instead of being a mere scullion of least possible government which renders all government contemptible, is looked to as a giant stature of Manhood, with the functions of a whole Humanity; books, reviews, newspapers, town-talk, are full of the schemes and dreams of a new order, as if the winding up of the old were a foregone conclusion and men were on the watch for a guide to show them the better way.

Is there such a guide, any corporate intelligence wise enough to lead them, and at the same time august enough to command their following? And if that guidance be not the office of the Church, if any other ensign than hers is to be hailed at the front of human progress, how can she pretend longer to have the mind of Christ and represent His Kingship of foremost service? And if through want of her leadership men go ignorantly and tread down sacred inclosures in search of the future way, and stumble and fall, and break the limbs of their Manhood and make it a crippled and ugly thing, whose will be the condemnation? Is the Church ready? Does she see clearly the course of human destiny? Are the Christ-features of Man, the personal and the social Man, distinctly outlined to her vision? Can she step forward with the confidence that once led civilization through the wrecks of the Roman world and wildernesses of barbarism, Church of the Ages still, ages future as well as past? The route will not be the same. The roads of ecclesiastical absolutism will be trodden no more, nor will men run hither and thither after tracks of sectarian individualism, to be lost again in swamps of doubt and denial and utter lonelihood of soul. The Church they follow must have in her own organization the archetype of the society which they will own as indeed a social incarnation, the human form of God, because the divine form of man. That form, however hidden, however bemocked, however cross-bent, must even now dwell somewhere on the

earth; else the Incarnation is a fable, and God-manhood a dream.

Is it not thine, O Church of the English peoples, who hast created a Nation and trained it to freedom of patient self-control, and sent it forth into all lands to give them the language of thy worship as the world's future tongue, and federated its colonies into a pledge of the world-wide Republic that is to be? Is not thy name on all the winds of entreaty that blow across the wastes of social want? Is it not thy familiar way that men are seeking, the way that blends society and individual in reciprocities of interest and love and life; the way that worships Christ as both a man and as Man; the way that shines with the sense of divine presence in all secularities as sacred because human, and because human also divine? And will they not follow thee the more eagerly for having warned them in other days of the perils of the courses that brought them to quagmires where they expected Edens? Hearken, O Church of the Galilean Carpenter to God's trumpet in the times, and bid the peoples in His Name go forward. They are coming; coming with a tramp that will beat down whatever hinders their march; coming from cloisters whose air has grown too musty for the breathings of larger desire; from palaces whose *ennui* wearies; from factories whose machinery has yet to run by soul as well as by steam; from fields and markets and forges and docks and quarries and mines, elbow to elbow, with the million-footed stride of a single purpose to find the better work, the better wage, the better wealth, the better world. And they are thine if thou wilt but lead them, henceforth, to advance under banners of brotherly love and towards the God that is in Man.

C. S. U. NOTES FOR MEMBERS.

THE one thousand dollars called for by the Executive Committee in order that the C. S. U., under its reorganized form, might carry out its new program has now been raised or pledged.

All dues and pledges of money conditioned on the one thousand dollars being raised, are therefore now payable to the Treasurer, Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, 40 State Street, Boston, Mass.

The amount has been raised or pledged in this way: —

Dues paid, $1.00 each	$201 00
Dues pledged, $1.00 each	66 00
Donations paid	298 00
Donations pledged	379 00
Guaranteed by Ex. Com.	56 00
	$1,000 00

There were in the old C. S. U. 1,052 members. We have heard favorably from 201. Only 24 have written declining membership in the reorganized C. S. U. There remain, therefore, 761 members yet to be heard from.

The Union is now ready to go to active work. It will, according, to its announcement, issue two papers each month, arranged in two series, marked A and B. Series A, to be issued about the first of each month, will consist of papers stating or bearing upon the general position and principles of the C. S. U. Series B, to be issued about the middle of each month, will consist of papers stating or bearing upon more concrete, economic, or social themes.

The Executive Committee has voted to send its Publications to all the old members, whether they have paid their dues or not, up to May 1, 1895. This is done to give any who have not renewed their membership a chance to do so. After May 1 the issues will be sent only to those who have paid their dues.

The Executive Committee has voted that all dues paid before May 1, 1895, shall be counted for the financial year beginning at that time. No one who pays now will be called on again for dues till May 1, 1896.

We thank those who have responded so cordially to the endeavor to reorganize the work of the Union, and now that it is planted, we hope, on a satisfactory basis, we ask that all take hold in extending its work and fulfilling its needed purpose.

GEORGE HODGES, *General Secretary*.

3565 19

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 2. | MAY 1, 1895. | PER ANNUM, $1.00. SINGLE NUMBERS, 10 c.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY

IN RELATION TO THE

SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY

BY THE

REV. W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., LL.D.

Fellow and Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Tooke Professor of Economic Science in King's College, London.

CAMBRIDGE.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

3 MASON STREET.

1895.

THE ANNUAL MEETING

Will be held at the Diocesan House, 1 Joy Street, Boston, Tuesday, May 14, at 3 P. M. There will be a public service the same evening at St. Paul's Church, at which the Bishop of Massachusetts will preside, and which will be addressed by the Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D.D., and Mr. John W. Wood, of New York, on "The Church and the Community."

PUBLICATIONS.

The following papers have appeared, or will shortly appear, in the Publications of the Union. They may be had from the Secretary at ten cents each; subscription, one dollar per annum.

SERIES A.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.
Rev. R. A. Holland, S. T. D.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY IN RELATION TO THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.
Very Rev. C. W. Stubbs, D. D.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D.

AN ADDRESS BEFORE HARVARD UNIVERSITY.
Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D.D.

SERIES B.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE OF 1894.
Prof. W. J. Ashley.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIMES.
Prof. Henry C. Adams.

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.

AN EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

AMERICAN TRADES UNIONS.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY IN RELATION TO THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.

BY THE REV. W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., LL. D.

"Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" — MATT. xx. 15.

SUCH an absolute claim to arbitrary power as the parable ascribes to the Eastern landowner would rarely be made in our country in the present day: hackneyed phrases about property having its duties as well as its rights are on every lip, and even those who are inclined to hold to their rights in the most stringent form at least feel that it is most unwise to press them offensively. And yet the very fact that the claims of property are put forward somewhat guardedly may in itself supply food for reflection. There are so many conflicting opinions; and the opposing parties, in regard to any proposal where the rights of property are affected, seem to have no ground in common. There hardly seems to be any recognized principle which is generally accepted, and on which it is possible to take a stand. Even the best established maxims on which property rests seem to be turned into new weapons to attack it. The title to property by right of conquest earns no respect. Why should not the man who took things violently be violently dispossessed? The title by prescription, long and undisturbed possession, seems to have little weight. If you have enjoyed a large estate for a long time, it may be retorted, isn't it fair that some one else should have a turn? So the ground seems to be cut away from the old legal principles, and we are set adrift into a troubled sea where conflicting interests struggle to assert themselves and changing tides of sentiment prevail. Discussions are so apt to resolve themselves into arguments from ex-

pediency. The optimist and the pessimist make different forecasts as to the probable effects of some measure, and there seems to be no means of deciding between them, or of convincing either of right and wrong apart from considerations of consequences. We never seem to get to a firm foundation of any sort at all.

2. This becomes more striking if we take some simple principle of justice, as between man and man, and note the different directions in which it may be expanded, when it is applied to this subject of property. Every man has a right to enjoy the fruits of his own labor; to get his own pleasure, whatever it is, out of what he has fairly earned.

But if on the one hand the labor of mind, forethought, and enterprise are taken into account, there is no kind of property legally acquired in a man's own lifetime for which he may not claim the shelter of this plain maxim of justice; while if in the right to enjoy, is included a right to dispose of as he deems best, the claims of those who have inherited property seem equally secure. It is easy, too, to dilate on the mischief that might ensue from any interference with a man's right to enjoy his own. It is easy to show that any increased sense of insecurity would be fraught with widespread evil — that credit would be shaken and enterprise checked, and the field for employment diminished. Hence, from the simple principle of natural justice we seem so easily to reach, if we travel by one road, a position of uncompromising resistance to all interference with property, and a timorous reluctance to modify the conditions on which the less defensible forms of private property — next presentations, public-houses, and slaves — are held and transferred.

But we may travel from the same starting-point by a very different road and reach very different conclusions. We may point out that many labor very hard, and get little, if any, fruit from it, while others who are at best sleeping partners in the industry of the world, reap abundant returns. It seems as if justice demanded that all who labor should at least receive a minimum of enjoyment as the fruit of their labor. And hence we find men looking hopefully towards some scheme of redistribution, which should recognize labor as a first title to

enjoyment, and the minimum of decent livelihood for all workers as a first charge upon the national dividend. To limit the opportunities of individuals, to amass vast fortunes, to pillage, ruthlessly it may be those who have too much, — that seems at least to be equitable as between man and man. And if there are faint hearts that fear lest such an attempt to deal with the fortunes of individuals and hamper enterprise should even discourage industry and pauperize those who were assured of support, the sanguine man is apt to waive aside their forebodings with the cheerful conviction that existing social arrangements are so bad, that any change must be for the better. Thus it is that the same principle of human justice, applied by different men of different temperaments, leads some of us to be the uncompromising and indiscriminate defenders of property, and some to be ready for almost any attack on the possessions of the very rich.

3. From this chaos of conflicting principles, of calculations of social expediency and applications of human justice, we can but turn to ask if our religion has guidance to give us; and we shall not ask in vain. It will not, indeed, serve to supply a cut-and-dried scheme for adjusting all social wrongs. Christ disclaimed the position of an arbiter in disputes, or a divider of property, and He has not commissioned His followers to arrogate this position to themselves. Yet Christ has light to give us. He has come to reveal the Mind and Will of God; to teach us to look at the things of earth and the struggles of earth as God looks at them. He would fain raise us above the jarring of conflicting human interests, and the claims of contested human rights, and the jangling assertion and counter-assertion of half-truths, to the throne of God Himself; He would seek to help us each — even the simplest of us — to see these things in their true proportions, and with their due limits, as God does.

4. And this, at least, we may feel, if we try to rise to this point of view, that no human being, whatever his claims, can have a right to exclusive ownership or use as against God. We are His offspring, and all that we have is given by Him — given or lent. For man's life is so brief; one generation comes, another goes; naked he enters on life at birth, and all earthly possessions must

be left behind when he is called home at death. And the earth with all its fulness remains ; the mother earth, as we say, from which each new generation receives its strength and nurture till it passes away into oblivion. And God has called it all into being — has planned it all, and guides it all, and governs it all. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof," and we, whose powers are so limited, who can but adjust the forces of nature to do some little work, who can waste a little here, but cannot destroy one atom of all that God has created, what rights can any of us claim or attempt to enforce against God? The rights and privileges, and possessions and immunities of human proprietors sink into such miserable insignificance when once we realize the great truth, that fundamentally and truly all belongs to God, that the earth is the Lord's, that He is the only Proprietor, since all is His.

From this point of view, the true character of human ownership begins to come into light: it can never claim, under any circumstances, to be irresponsible or arbitrary. No mere human being is ever justified in asserting a right to do just as he likes with his own — to waste or destroy it: he has nothing that he has not received: all his powers and all his possessions have been entrusted to him, and he will be called on to account for everything that has been committed to his charge; he is not an absolute owner, free to carry out his whims capriciously, he is but a responsible servant, to whom a certain trust has been committed by God.

5. This conception of the human proprietor as a responsible steward, who discharges a function entrusted to him by God the Creator of all, serves to illumine many of the dark questions connected with the claims which are made on behalf of proprietors, and the duties to be done by them. It gives a real meaning to the phrase the "sacredness of property." We are bound to respect the property of others, and not to steal it, or covet it, or tamper with it, on very different grounds from those that are commonly alleged. There were times when might was the only effective protection which the rights of property obtained, and only the strong man armed could enjoy his goods in peace. But we claim that the property of the weak is to be secured, as well as that of the strong. For the Chris-

tian, respect for property is not merely a feeling extorted from him by those who can defend themselves; it is a duty in regard to the property of all. Again, in our times, respect for property is widely diffused because it seems to many of us inexpedient to move or weaken any of the institutions which lie at the foundation of our social system; but the expediency might come to be the other way; there is but a narrow line between such respect for property as this, and violent attacks on private possessions of every kind. For the Christian, it is not a mere question of leaving things as they are for fear we should make them worse if we touch them at all; for him the property of his neighbors, rich or poor, is *sacred*, because these neighbors are God's stewards, and their possessions have been entrusted to them by Him. In the order of His providence, through the natural gifts with which they are endowed, through the circumstances of society, which have come about by His permission, some have large possessions and some have small, but all are alike God's stewards, exercising a trust to which He has called them, responsible to Him for the way they exercise it. It is not our place, as private persons, to judge His servants, or re-allot the charge He has given them; their wealth is sacred, because it is really God's, and because God has committed it to them for the time. To us Christians, property is *sacred*, not because the owners are strong and we cannot get at their goods with impunity, not because we think it prudent to let things alone, but because we do not *dare* to take upon ourselves to re-assign the duties and responsibilities of God's stewards.

6. If this conception helps us to see how the rights of human property are to be regarded, and on what ground they are to be respected as sacred, it also shows us plainly how the duties of the man of property are to be discharged.

(*a*) In the first place, it is a man's duty to take care of his property; the old-fashioned virtues of prudence and thrift are never very popular, they may be easily caricatured as the selfishness of the money-grubbing churl; the man who squanders his possessions gets a reputation for being good-hearted; but, however genial his qualities may be, he is at least to blame for not taking life seriously and administering his wealth as wisely as he can. The

prodigal claims to please himself, and determines to have a merry time, even though it is a short one. Most of us deem him foolish, but at least we may say that he sins in this, that he has wholly failed to realize his responsibility to God as His steward. Recklessness and carelessness and waste are incompatible with a due regard to the sacredness of property.

If we see the disregard of this duty on the part of individuals at times, may we not feel, as we look at the length and breadth of the world, how terribly the human race have failed to fulfil it?

The earth, with all its fulness, is the Lord's; He has committed it to Man, and has bidden us to replenish it and make it a better world, more truly adapted to the needs of God's creatures. And on every side we see traces of the neglect of this duty; it is not merely a question of destruction deliberately done as a punishment in time of war, but of carelessness, and heedlessness, and waste. There are regions given over to desert now that were once fertile plains; there are masses of jungle now obscuring what were once flourishing cities; and these are monuments of Man's carelessness in wasting the resources which were put in his hands by the God of Nature. He was sent into the world to replenish the earth and improve it by his work; too often he has been false to the trust imposed in him, and has wasted and exhausted it instead.

(*b*) But more than this: the steward is responsible for carrying out his master's known wishes. The human owner is responsible, he is bound to use his own judgment and to do what he thinks is right; but he is bound to apply his property, not merely for his own enjoyment, but as God would have him do, for the greatest good of others. I do not say their greatest happiness, for that seems ambiguous. The man who is merely self-regarding in the use he makes of his wealth is not mindful of his responsibility. There was a time when the best way of fulfilling this duty of unselfish use seemed plain enough — the selling all one's goods to give to the poor — but we have got into the way of looking at ulterior consequences, and we must do our duty according to the light we have. We know that indiscriminate charity is an encouragement to idleness and sin; we know that the benefit it gives is

short-lived, that the evil it occasions is long continued. It is a common thing among novelists now to paint the difficulties of the virtuous millionaire who strives so to administer his wealth that he shall do good rather than evil; and the pictures they have portrayed may help us to feel the real difficulty which such men must find in doing their duty earnestly and unselfishly in that state of life to which it has pleased God to call them. To some it were easy to shirk the duty, but it never can be easy to do it; but those who as captains of industry, or as great landowners, honestly give their minds to the wise management of their business or their estates, are not necessarily self-seeking, because they continue to prosper.

7. The Christian conception of the sacredness of property enables us to see the grounds on which it is entitled to respect, and the aims which men should keep before them in using their possessions. I think it helps us to see, too, the grounds on which it may be rightly taken away. The civil power is ordained by God for the punishment of evil-doers and the praise of them that do well; and it may be the duty of the State to interfere with and readjust the relations to property — in God's name. The private man must recognize the sacredness of life, and dare not kill, whatever wrong he may have suffered; but the State may — in God's name — condemn to death. Just so the private individual ought to have regard to the sacredness of property, however poor he be; but the State may interfere with it in God's name; and interference thus made will not be dictated by private greed, but by public uses. And hence it will differ in character from proposals for readjustment that we hear of to-day. It is not on the quantity of a man's wealth, be it much or little, that we will fix our attention, but on the *manner* in which he uses it.

We are accustomed to interference with private property in a public interest, when men are compelled to sell the heritage of their fathers, perhaps, which they wish to keep, that a railway may be made, or some work of public utility carried out. We recognize that public utility must be preferred to private use, however long established. And from time immemorial, in cases of gross misuse, the State has stepped in to confiscate property. Possessions used for seditious or criminal purposes are rightly regarded as

forfeited. Between these extremes of interference with full compensation and of confiscation pure and simple, there may be many grades — different modes by which substantial justice may be done according to the circumstances of the cases — and the extent to which punishment for misuse enters, if it enters at all. But such interference with property, if it be not arbitrary and capricious, if it is not dictated by the lust of spoliation, but by a desire to do a duty as in the sight of God, can never impugn the sacredness of property, or damage its security, since it means, when it is thus conducted, that there is a public desire to use the material things which God has lent us, more worthily, a deliberate desire to carry out His Will upon earth. Christian respect for property rests on a refusal to displace those who are responsible for doing God's Will in a definite sphere. It is entirely consonant with this feeling that there should at times be earnest attempts of public authority to see that that Divine Will is more effectively realized among men.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY READING.

BY FRANCIS WATTS LEE.

BARRY, William. Rights of Public Property. Forum. Vol. IX., p. 208. April, 1890.

BOSANQUET, Bernard. The Principle of Private Property. (*In his* Aspects of the Social Problem. London. Macmillan. 1895. Pp. 308–318.)

An attempt to clear up the "confusion between the history of property and the reason of its existence."

CLARK, Edward H. G. Man's Birthright; or, the higher law of property. New York. Putnam. 1885. 133 pp. 16mo.

COBB, William F. The Fathers on Property. Economic Review. Vol. V., p. 191. April, 1895.

A reply to the papers by the Rev. C. L. Marson.

CUNNINGHAM, William. The Ethics of Money Investments. Economic Review. Vol. I., p. 13. January, 1891.

— The Use and Abuse of Money. New York. Scribner, 1891. xxv, 219 pp. 12mo.

DONISTHORPE, Wordsworth. What is Property? (*In his* Individualism: a System of Politics. London. Macmillan, 1889. Pp. 90–127.)

GARDNER, Percy. The Casuistry and Ethics of Investments. Economic Review. Vol. III., p. 501. October, 1893.

GLADDEN, Washington. Property in Land. Property in General. (*In his* Tools and the Man. Boston. Houghton. 1893. Pp. 55–114.)

GRAHAM, William. Private Property: Its origin, natural and historical. Communism and Private Property. (*In his* The Social Problem. London. Kegan Paul. 1886. Pp. 278–332.)

GREEN, Thomas H. The Right of the State in regard to Property. (*In his* Works. London. Longmans. 1886. Vol. II., Pp. 517–535.)

HERBERT, Aubernon E. M. Rights of Property. London. Liberty and Property Defence League. [1889.] 50 pp. 8vo.

HOADLEY, George. Constitutional Guarantees of the Right of Property. Journal of Social Science. No. XXVI., p. 13. 1890.

LAVELEYE, Émile L. V. de. Primitive Property. Translated by G. R. L. Marriott. London. Macmillan. 1878. xlvii, 356 pp. 8vo.

LETOURNEAU, Charles. Property: Its Origin and Development. London. W. Scott. 1892. xii, 401 pp. [The Contemporary Science Series.] Sm. 8vo.

LILLY, William S. The Ethics of Property. Forum. Vol. VIII., p. 595. February, 1890.

MACKAY, Thomas. Investment. (*In his* A Plea for Liberty. New York. Appleton. 1891. Pp. 227–258.)

MARSON, CHARLES L. The Church and the Democratic Idea. (*In* Reid, Andrew. The New Party. London. Hodder. 1894. Pp. 73–90.)

— Same. Dawn. Vol. VI., p. 132. September, 1894.

— Churchmen and their Politics. Westminster Review. Vol. CXLI., p. 180. February, 1894.

— The Social Teaching of the Early Fathers. (*In* Reid, Andrew. Vox Clamantium. London. Innes, 1894. Pp. 198–224.)

— Same. Dawn. Vol. VI., p. 121, July–August, 1894.

These articles claim the authority of the Fathers for Socialistic doctrines. See reply by Rev. W. F. Cobb.

OTTLEY, ROBERT L. The Ethics of Property. (*In* Lombard Street in Lent. London. Stock. 1894. Pp. 38–58.)

— Same. (*In* Abreast of the Times. New York. Pott. 1894. Pp. 38–58.)

PROUDHON, P. J. What is Property? Translated by Benj. R. Tucker. Princeton. Tucker. 1876. xli, 407 pp. 8vo.

RITCHIE, DAVID G. Locke's Theory of Property. Economic Review. Vol. I., p. 29, January, 1891.

— The Right of Property. (*In his* Natural Rights. London. Sonnenschein, 1895. Pp. 263–271.)

SHELDON, W. L. What justifies Private Property? Inter. Jour. of Ethics. Vol. IV., p. 17, October, 1893.

SIDGWICK, HENRY. On Property. (*In his* The Elements of Politics. London. Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 62–77.)

WARREN, WALTER R. The History of Private Property. (*In* Reid, Andrew. The New Party. London. Hodder. 1894. Pp. 115–143.)

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

OBJECTS. — 1. To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. 2. To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time. 3. To present CHRIST in practical life as the living Master and King, the Enemy of wrong and selfishness, the Power of righteousness and love.

MEMBERSHIP is open to all communicants of the Episcopal Church upon application to the Secretary and the payment of one dollar per annum.

SUBSCRIPTION to the Publications, one dollar per annum. Special rate to members: annual dues and subscription to the Publications both at one time, strictly in advance, one dollar.

PRESIDENT.

The Rt. Rev. F. D. HUNTINGTON, S. T. D.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

The Rt. Rev. HENRY C. POTTER, D. D.
The Rev. JOSEPH REYNOLDS.
The Rev. ROBERT A. HOLLAND, S. T. D.
Prof. RICHARD T. ELY, Ph. D.
GEORGE E. MCNEIL.

SECRETARY.

The Rev. GEORGE HODGES, D. D., 3 Mason Street, Cambridge, Mass.

TREASURER.

ROBERT H. GARDINER, 40 State Street, Boston, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Rev. J. W. SUTER, *Chairman.*

Prof. W. J. ASHLEY, M. A.
EDMUND BILLINGS.
The Rev. W. D. P. BLISS.
The Rev. C. H. BRENT.
The Rev. W. L. BULL.
The Rev. W. B. FRISBY.
FRANCIS WATTS LEE.
The Rev. PHILO W. SPRAGUE.
The Rev. FLOYD TOMPKINS, Jr.
JOHN W. WOOD.

COUNCIL.

The foregoing and
The Rt. Rev. H. M. THOMPSON, S.T.D.
The Rt. Rev. DAVIS SESSUMS, D. D.
The Rev. ARTHUR BROOKS, D. D.
Prof. JAMES H. DILLARD.
Miss HELENA S. DUDLEY.
The Rev. Prof. E. P. GOULD, D. D.
The Rev. PERCY S. GRANT.
JAMES L. HOUGHTELING.
WILLIAM P. JOHNSTON, LL. D.
The Rev. J. S. LINDSAY, D. D.
The Rev. ARTHUR LOWNDES.
J. BLEEKER MILLER.
The Rev. HENRY MOTTETT, D. D.
The Rev. E. N. POTTER, D. D.
The Rev. W. S. RAINSFORD, D. D.
Miss VIDA D. SCUDDER.
ARCHIBALD L. SESSIONS.
The Rev. H. H. SLEEPER, Ph. D.
The Rev. WILLIAM HARMAN VAN ALLEN.
The Rev. GEORGE R. VAN DE WATER, D. D.
EVERETT P. WHEELER.
The Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS.
GEORGE ZABRISKIE.

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 3. | JUNE 1, 1895. | PER ANNUM, $1.00. SINGLE NUMBERS, 10c.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

AND THE

CHURCH.

BY THE

RT. REV. F. D. HUNTINGTON, S. T. D.

Bishop of Central New York, President of the Union.

[Reprinted from The Forum, October, 1890.]

BOSTON.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

THE DIOCESAN HOUSE,

1895.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY READING.

BY FRANCIS WATTS LEE.

ADDERLEY, JAMES G. Christ and Social Reform. London. S. P. C. K. 1893. 32 pp. 16mo.

BEMIS, EDWARD W. The Relation of the Church to Social Problems. Boston. Society of Christian Socialists. [1890.] 11 pp. 8vo.

BLISS, WILLIAM D. P. The Social Faith of the Catholic Church. Boston. Office of The Dawn. 1894. 23 pp. 8vo.

BUTLER, HENRY M. The Christian Social Union. Economic Review. Vol. III., p. 2. January, 1893.

CAMPION, WILLIAM H. J. Christianity and Politics. (*In* Gore, Charles. Lux Mundi. Pp. 365–388. New York. U. S. Book Co. 1891.)

COMMONS, JOHN R. Social Reform and the Church. With an introduction by Richard T. Ely. New York. Crowell. [1894.] x., 176 pp. 16mo.

DOLLING, ROBERT W. R. The Christian Clergyman's Place in Politics. Portsmouth, England. 1892. 12 pp. 16mo.

ELY, RICHARD T. Social Aspects of Christianity. New York. Crowell. [1889.] x (1), 132 pp. 12mo.

FREEMANTLE, WILLIAM H. The World as the Subject of Redemption. With an introduction by Richard T. Ely. New York. Longmans. 1892. 470 pp. 12mo.

FRY, THOMAS C. A Social Policy for Churchmen. Economic Review. Vol. II., p. 50. January, 1892.

—— A Social Policy for the Church, and other papers on Social subjects. London. Rivington. 1893. (4) 128 pp. Sm. 8vo.

GLADDEN, WASHINGTON. Applied Christianity; Moral aspects of Social questions. Boston. Houghton. 1886. 320 pp. 16mo.

—— Tools and the Man. Boston. Houghton. 1893. vi (1), 308 pp. 16mo.

HANCOCK, THOMAS. Christ and the People. Sermons chiefly on the Obligations of the Church to the State and to Humanity. 2d. edition. London. Hodges. 1882. 12, xvii, 468 pp. Sm. 8vo.

HEADLAM, STEWART D. The Laws of Eternal Life; being Studies in the [social teaching] of the Church Catechism. London. Verinder. 1888. (4), 56 pp. Sm. 8vo.

—— Priestcraft and Progress; being sermons and lectures. 2d edition. London. Hodges. 1882. vi. (1) 116 pp. Sm. 8vo.

—— The Secular Work of Jesus Christ, His Apostles, and the Church of England. London. Women's Printing Co. 20 pp. Sm. 8vo.

—— The Service of Humanity and other sermons. London. Hodges. 1882. 134 pp. Sm. 8vo.

HERRON, GEORGE D. The New Redemption. A Call to the Church to Reconstruct Society according to the Gospel of Christ. New York. Crowell. [1893.] 176 pp. 16mo.

—— The Christian Society. New York. Revell. 1894. 158 pp. 12mo.

HILL, DAVID J. The Social Influence of Christianity. Boston. Silver. 1888. 231 pp. 12mo.

HOLLAND, HENRY SCOTT. What Attitude should the Church Adopt towards the Aims and Methods of Labor Combinations? Economic Review. Vol. II., p. 441. October, 1892.

(*Continued on the last page.*)

time has come when workmen ask not charity, but justice; not the property of other men, but their own; God's common gifts to the people for the people's use; nothing more. If strikes and strikers demand more, the Church cannot countenance their demand. According to the last report of the New York commissioner of labor statistics, there have been in that State, during five years, 9,384 strikes, with 338,900 laborers taking part in them. To ordinary eyes it does not appear probable that anything like that number of sane men in this country would hazard their livelihood without cause. Yet it is not the Church's business to advocate or to promote strikes. Quite as little may it be expected, in the face of recent social science and of the labor bureaus of our cities, to encourage soup kitchens, poor laws, the old-time dole, or the distribution of cast-off clothing. It must achieve its gracious ends, if at all, by creating convictions in all classes which will render these unhealthy remedies of an unhealthy condition superfluous, and by allying itself fearlessly with all the restorative forces that are rising into action in the mind and conscience of our time. Above all, it must remember that what is to be sought in behalf of the suffering class first and foremost, is not their material, but their moral elevation—their spiritual salvation. It is to enlist in no crusade for those who "enforce their rights with hands of iron, while they disclaim their duties with fronts of brass." A sordid materialism is just as bad at one end of the social scale as at the other. The whole matter is degraded and belittled if we forget that the worst evil, even among the poor, is not their poverty. There must be a higher moral and a deeper longing in them, and in us who try to help them, than to obtain an easier lot, more to eat and drink and wear, or more leisure for dissipation, indolence, and amusement. But just as careful ought Christians to be not to hide their social inconsistencies under some sophistical religious generalities; not to act or preach as if having our "conversation in heaven" were to postpone a heavenly order of society to a future world, instead of setting it up on the earth; and heartily and practically to believe that the Church has not gone beyond the need of being reformed back to its original charter.

F. D. Huntington.

HOLLAND, ROBERT A. The Church of the World. Cambridge. 1895. 15 pp. The Church Social Union. Publications. Series A., No. 1.] 8vo.

HUNTINGTON, FREDERIC D. "The Golden Rule applied to Business and Social Life." Address before the Evangelical Education Society. [Baltimore, 1892.] 20 pp. 8vo.

—— "The Gospel and the People." Address at a Meeting of the National Evangelical Alliance. Dec. 5, 1889. New York. Whittaker. [1890.] 16 pp. Sm. 8vo.

HYDE, WILLIAM DEW. Outlines of Social Theology. New York. Macmillan. 1895. ix, 260 pp. 12mo.

LEE, FRANCIS W. Notes on the Social Teaching of the Christian Year. [As set forth in the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of the Book of Common Prayer.] *In* The Dawn, Vol. VI., No. 2. — Vol. VII., No. 2. Feb., 1894. — Feb., 1895.

NOEL, RODEN. Christianity and Social Advance. (*In* Reid, Andrew. Vox Clamantium. Pp. 315–354. London. Innes. 1894.)

OTTLEY, ROBERT L. Christian Ethics. (*In* Gore, Charles. Lux Mundi. Pp. 389–436. New York. U. S. Book Co. 1891.)

——The Special Importance of the Study of Christian Ethics for the Church in the Present Day. Economic Review. Vol. III., p. 229. April, 1893.

RICHMOND, WILFRID J. Christian Economics. London. Rivingtons. 1888. xix, 278 pp. Sm. 8vo.

—— Economic Morals. Four Lectures. London. Allen. 1890. xvi, 134 pp. Sm. 8vo.
Of peculiar interest as resulting in the formation by those who had heard these lectures of the Christian Social Union in England and subsequently of The Church Social Union in America.

ROADS, CHARLES. Christ Enthroned in the Industrial World. A Discussion of Christianity in Property and Labor. New York. Hunt. 1893. 287 pp., 12mo.

SANDAY, WILLIAM. Christianity and Social Duty. Economic Review. Vol. III., p. 348. July, 1893.
A rejoinder to Dr. Stanton.

—— The Social Movement. (*In his* Two Present-Day Questions. pp. 47–72. London. Longmans. 1892.)

SHELDON, W. L. What Attitude should the Pulpit take to the Labor Problem? Inter. Journal of Ethics. Vol. II., p. 439. July, 1892.

SHUTTLEWORTH, HENRY C. The Christian Church and the Problem of Poverty. (*In* Reid, Andrew. Vox Clamantium. Pp. 6–46. London. Innes. 1894.)

STANTON, VINCENT H. Christianity and Social Duty. Economic Review. Vol. III., p. 87. January, 1893.
A reply to Dr. Sanday's The Social Movement.

STRONG, JOSIAH. The New Era; or, The Coming Kingdom. New York. Baker. [1893.] xx, 374 pp. 12mo.

STUBBS, CHARLES W. Christ and Economics. London. Isbister. 1893. 292 (2) pp. Sm. 8vo.

WALKER, JOHN B. The Church and Poverty. [Washington (?) 1891.] 32 pp. 16mo.

WESTCOTT, BROOKE F. The Christian Social Union. Economic Review. Vol. III., p. 1. January, 1893.

—— The Christian Social Union. Economic Review. Vol. V., p. 154. April, 1895.

—— The Incarnation a Revelation of Human Duties. London. S. P. C. K. 1892. 53 pp. Sm. 8vo.

—— Same. (*In his* The Incarnation and Common Life. Pp. 41–106. London. 1893.)

—— The Incarnation and Common Life. London. Macmillan. 1893. xii, 428 pp. Sm. 8vo.

—— The Social Aspects of Christianity. London. Macmillan. 1887. xx, 202 pp. Sm. 8vo.

PERIODICALS.

THE CHURCH REFORMER. Monthly. Edited by the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam. London. F. Verinder. 8 Duke St. Adelphi. Two shillings and sixpence per annum.

THE DAWN. Monthly. Edited by the Rev. W. D. P. Bliss. Boston. 241 Tremont St. Fifty cents per annum.

THE ECONOMIC REVIEW. Quarterly. Edited by the Rev. John Carter. London. Published for the Oxford branch of the Christian Social Union by Rivington, Percival & Co. 34 King St., Covent Garden. Ten shillings per annum.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH.

When a great mixed audience in one of the public halls in New York cheered the name of Jesus Christ and hissed the name of the Church, it settled no question, solved no problem, proved no proposition, expounded no Scripture; but it was as significant as half the sermons that are preached. Whence came that discrimination? There have been times when the people heard the words "Christ and the Church" with reverent silence, if not with enthusiastic devotion. There have been a few fanatical disbelievers who have cursed both the Nazarene and his kingdom. Only in these later days, when workingmen think and read, reason and reflect, does a promiscuous crowd, rudely rather than irreverently, take the two apart, honoring the one and scouting the other.

No matter where or in what age the Church is found, no matter what influences of climate, race, environment, political economy, or social customs play upon it, the guide of its life must be one and the same. No institution of any power or mark has been so completely identified with its founder, or so dependent on its original force for the accomplishment of its real end. Whatever its perversions or aberrations, they are corrected only by reference to one standard. The secret of this law is in the fact that the relation of the founder or planter to the thing

Copyright, 1889, by the Forum Publishing Company.

founded or planted, to the living, organic creature, is not external but internal. He who is its life principle is more than builder or vine-dresser. The working law and rule of action are in the constitution, and the constitution of the Church is Christ. No inference can be plainer, reluctant as ecclesiastical leaders and "authorities" have been to confess it practically, than that the duty of the Church to the unprivileged is to be learned from the treatment they received in the personal bearing, acts, and teachings of the Christ of the New Testament; and it is not now pretended, we believe, that there is any other Christ. For the present purpose, any definition of the word "Church" is conveniently avoided. Let it be assumed that it includes all persons who "profess and call themselves Christians." The term "unprivileged" is used for a class, rather than other terms like "lower," "laboring," "poor," or "proletarian," as being, on the whole, descriptive, fair, respectful, and comprehensive.

The Christian law, as between these two divisions of society, would not be materially different from what it is if the destructive new criticism of the Christian writings were to be accepted. The question would remain, Who made the Christian religion? Not Hebrew piety, for the first war Christianity waged was with Judaism; not Athenian civilization, for the new religion declared Greek society to be rotten to its vitals, and smote it in the face; not the Roman empire, for that ridiculed the Gospel and tried to kill it. If a dozen fishermen and peasants made it, they certainly did not make it in the interest of patricians or of nabobs. For the present purpose it is assumed, passing by all critical and exegetical questions, that the ethical contents of Christianity are due to a person from whose name that word is derived. In fact, the rationalistic schools themselves have generally no quarrel with the writings as they are in regard to moral duty or social rights. The sublime proclamation at Nazareth, which announced the new kingdom, declaring its fundamental and everlasting principle, is not in dispute. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." He

"closed the book," but he opened the meaning; and not for Nazareth, or Judea, or the Roman empire alone, or for one land or one generation more than another, but for all the lands and generations and nationalities of the earth. Where the Church, swayed by selfish privilege, has been false to its head, it has contented itself with letting the passage stand untouched.

Did Christ recognize classes? He recognized them as actual, but not as necessary, or even as legitimate, in the order of society which he came to establish. He did not propose that order as a scheme, but predicted and commanded it as a social reality or kingdom. "It shall not be so among you," he said. It is well enough to speak of Christianity as an "ideal"; he did not present it in that way. It was embodied in a person, and in him it began to be as an economy. Classes would belong to it only so far as there would be broad distinctions made by character; they would be not "according to what a man hath," but to what a man is. In naming the classes that he found existing, he followed his habit of using words that would be most readily understood, and of naming things as they appear to the eye; his object not being scientific but more than scientific. The less serves the greater; literal inaccuracy promotes the reception of a larger truth. Reformers often do this; but he is more than a reformer, he is a social renewer, breathing into society and man a divine spirit. Material things are with him images of immaterial or spiritual things. The unprivileged are "the poor"; the privileged are "the rich." But those privileges are not of the economy that is to be, and their claim to superiority and exclusiveness is doomed.

On the same principle, this prophetic master did not make differences of property, rank, or station the ground of favor or of standing in his new society. In the judgment immediately coming, men would not be accounted of by anything outside of them. The tribunal would be more awful than that, searching and inevitable. The rich are condemned, not in the least because they are rich, but because of what they allow their riches to do to them, or of the way these riches have been obtained or used; and there is no bitterness in the condemnation. The riches have spoilt manhood, the only thing worth keeping; and that is the

"woe." No more are the poor approved, praised, or blessed for their poverty, for their destitution, or for its material incidents. They are a Christian aristocracy, so far as their hardship has nurtured in them traits which, in the rich, ease and luxury have emasculated, making them frivolous, indolent, selfish, and cruel. This is explained sufficiently in the Master's trenchant instructions. He qualified the sentence which seemed to shut out the privileged from his kingdom, by letting the penalty fall, not on them that have riches, but on them that trust in them, that is, that put them in place of a divine magnanimity, justice, and self-sacrifice.

At the same time, there is no denying that this head of a new earth and new heavens did see the two classes which the world had sundered, and that he made his choice between them. Deliberately, emphatically, uniformly, he stood on one side of the dividing line, and placed there the moral foundations of his empire of love. He lived there, sought his companionships and lodgings there, was at home there, bestowed there his honors and benedictions. There is no beatitude that reads, "Blessed are the rich, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"; no rule of selection proclaiming, "I have chosen the rich of this world." There is no malediction or threat saying, "Woe unto you poor men, hard-working men, ill-clad men, unlettered men; men that are managed, bought, and sold; men at the mercy of capitalists and corporations; men dictated to, kept down, taken advantage of, with small chance in a lawsuit or if accused of a theft, forced into a 'class' whether you like it or not." It is all the other way—the whole Gospel, from the lowly yet triumphant *Magnificat* of the virgin mother, to the unbounded and impartial invitation to free waters of eternal life at the end of the Apocalypse. We all know it would not be a Gospel if it were otherwise, but an absurd mockery of a Gospel. No audacity can deny it; no money king, no queen of fashion, no ingenious exegesis can expunge it from the record, or alter or blur the handwriting. There the letters of light shine, from generation to generation; hurry over them, put glosses on them, refer them to local circumstances and temporary peculiarities, forget them, shut the book, as we will. No critical impatience can revise the translation in

favor of privilege; none has dared to try it. Christ's men are to be brothers, and in no twisted or hidden sense. His society is to be a society of liberty, of justice, of equal rights (not faculties or possessions), of out-and-out fairness, of thorough-going good-will. Political economists may dispute this fact; they must start from some other point, move on other paths, appeal to other authority. Out of this oracle, constitution, and personal life alone the Church is to take its answers to the question as to what its duty is respecting social problems.

At first, and for a long time, this original conviction lingered as a divine instinct, and not less as an undoubted principle, in the Christian household. It utters itself naturally and freely in the voices of the early fathers. No characteristics of the primitive Christian manners are more conspicuous than humanity, simplicity, and fraternity. No contrast between the heathen and Christian communities was sharper than that in the esteem shown for those who live on other men's toil, and for those who do the world's work and who bear the burden of its drudgeries. Sanctuaries of Christian worship sheltered and protected the captive till he could be dealt with lawfully. Just as fast as the spirit which Christ always declared to be antagonistic to his religion, and which he called "the world," crept into the Church, usurped the control of its affairs, and put a lock on the lips of its ministers, this first law of equity was sacrificed—the second crucifixion. Long before Phocas played into the hands of a secular papacy, before Latin princes were substituted for servants of the Nazarene, and before Adrian stamped a pope's name on Roman coin, the world had largely bought up the Church's title and estate, and found profit in administering it for the world's entertainment.

As operating through human agencies, the Church has an ecclesiastical apparatus, policy, financial system, officers, and honors. One of its primary duties in behalf of the unprivileged class is to see that the array of this machinery allows no favoritism, and that it concedes nothing to the ambition, arrogance, pride, or fastidiousness of wealth. Scarcely less than formularies of belief or decrees of councils, in moral impression, is this ecclesiastical polity. To innumerable people who read little and

think less, it is the inarticulate but significant interpretation of church Christianity. Either they accept it as the Christianity of Christ, judging him by the system and supposing that in despising or hating the system they reject Christ; or else, with keener intelligence, like the workingmen's assembly in New York, they discriminate, hissing the Church and applauding the great Workingman. More than half the religious organizations, large or small, are at present practical contradictions of the sermon on the mount. It does not need an ostentatious hierarchy to open the door for the "prince of this world," letting him in where he does tenfold the mischief he could do by persecutions, seductions, or infidel arguments outside. He buys up the property, holds the keys of pew doors, puts rich families in the foremost seats, hires and pays the choir, raises funds by lotteries and theatricals, tells the "lower classes" to stay out in the streets or patronizes them with a mission chapel in the outskirts, makes a fashion plate of the female worshipers, sees to it that parish offices and all other marks of distinction are assigned to prosperous merchants, politicians, and leaders of society—never to mechanics and day laborers who have no qualifications except piety and good sense —suits the preacher to the tastes of the ruling set, and "runs the concern." What is all this parochial mammonism and snobbery but a surrender of the kingdom of the crucified to his adversary? Where is the divine brotherhood? Meantime, prudent care is taken to keep the holy language and handsome ceremonial safe, and not to put St. Dives into the calendar.

The Church will further do its duty by a generous, and if need be a forbearing, sympathy with the movements and measures, not bearing its name, which are products of the "labor problem." They are new to the Church and new to the world. They are almost as unlike as possible to the guilds of the middle ages. They are not political insurrections, and will not be if this duty of the Church is done. They are not communistic phantasies. They have an inherent vitality, a plausible reason, numerical strength, and a spreading activity. They will not be impressed by the intelligence or fairness of one who jumbles them all together under a supercilious sneer—anarchy, socialism, nationalism, municipalism, trades unions, knights of labor,

single-tax land-ownership—as if they were one malign or foolish brood, instead of being quite as unlike one another as the Protestant religious sects. Nor will they be either guided or subdued by petulance. Their fatal inconsistency, their sad incapacity of unification, their pathetic lack of leadership, the Church will look on with pity, not with contempt, if it has the spirit of its shepherd king whom the common people heard gladly. Why does not the Church make itself their leader? If a peer in the House of Lords could say the other day that Christianity is the most perfect system of democracy, why should not organized Christianity prove itself to be that? If the Archbishop of Canterbury could say in a speech, "Trust the people, give them their rights as citizens, and they will not abuse them," why should not the popular ministers say it to the mill-owners, and corporation lawyers, and employers of shirt-makers and cigar-makers, in their congregations, emphasizing and illustrating the second clause? Now and then a fearless voice is lifted up by a John Baptist, John Chrysostom, Savonarola, Anselm, Latimer, Lacordaire, or Ugo Bassi; but how often the pulpit of Christendom has missed its opportunity by its timidity! Amiably, and after their manner usefully no doubt, well-meaning, peace-loving shepherds have led and comforted their flocks; but not till long after the peal of the trumpet which the sons of thunder put to their lips has died away, and their cause has been gained, have messengers of the modern Israel ventured to take up their cry. Time and events have shown what harvests they might have reaped, what names they might have transmitted, what inspiring memorials they might have left behind.

Take the horrible inhumanities of land-ownership in the evictions of the peasants of Ireland after the famine of '47, almost matched by those of Scotland, and more than matching those of the sixteenth century, exposed in the trenchant works of Mackenzie, Godkin, and Wallace. Take the indescribable barbarities and debaucheries in most districts of outdoor labor in England, detailed in the reports of royal agricultural commissions. Take the facts that two thousand men own half of the land of England and that thirty millions own none, while a similar proportion is fast growing up in the United States; or the

fact that only about one fourth of the entire income of English labor is paid to the productive wage-workers who produce and distribute the wealth. Take the authenticated statement that, less than sixty years ago, at a time when Doyle's report proved that in most of the English counties the weekly wages of workmen were insufficient to command a supply of the reasonable comforts of life, clergymen of the Church dismissed the evidence by attributing the destitution to want of thrift, or to intemperance, forgetting that misery, bad air, overcrowding, and unwholesome and insufficient food drive men to drink as often as drink drives its votaries to pauperism.

Recent certified revelations have laid bare the multiplied horrors and depravities of the tenement population in great cities, where forty-one out of every hundred families live each in a single room, where the poorest working class are actually made to pay a higher rent in proportion to income than those in any other part of the community, and where the poorest pay more rent than the richest for each cubic foot of space and air. These facts put it beyond question that, in the name of a common humanity, and as sure as there is an ethical element in Christianity at all, there are social sins and human equities which have a more urgent and imperative claim on the consideration of ecclesiastical councils and of weekly sermons than any questions of discipline, ritual, hymnology, or predestination. It is not necessary to call out the names of real-estate tyrants or of savage sweaters in New York and Philadelphia, any more than it is necessary in Great Britain to arraign personally the Dukes of Portland, Westminster, Bedford, and others, for the oppressions and sufferings of great sections of British cities of which they hold the titles. There is a sense of right, after all, which can be reached and stirred without personal vituperation, by men called and set apart to holy offices, if they are sincere and candid, and if their lives agree with their preaching. Is it said that this would foster violence and provoke insurrectionary clamor? Telling the truth has generally been safe in the long run, and it was never safer than it is now, when the truth is likely to be told at any rate. An earnest and patient treatment of social wrongs by a wide and large-hearted Church, is as likely as Congress or the courts to

heal discontent and to forestall insurrection. Even Mr. Hyndman says: "However successful a revolution might be, it is certain that mankind cannot change its whole nature at once. Break the old shell certainly, but never forget that the new forms must grow out of the old."

Suppose the churchmen and the dissenters had seen their duty, and had discharged it with clearsightedness and courage; who can doubt that English statesmen, Parliament, and people would have found out in less than three generations that, through monstrous manufacturing interests and their incalculable profits, England, since the factory system came in, has made itself infamous by the most hideous and brutal form of slavery ever known to the civilized world—the white slavery which, on a vast scale, has tasked, tortured, and slaughtered children under ten years of age, exterminated chastity and decency in the dwellings of factory workers, turned men into brutes, and made society into a hell? Would Lord John Russell's remark still be true, that "it takes England forty years to accomplish a reform admitted to be necessary"?

The Church does not discharge its duty by silencing the voices of its prophets. Prophets are not creatures of institutions, nor are they made to uphold the existing order of things or to apologize for it. Shame for their portion have monarchies or republics that do not know their great men! Woe to the nation that stones its children because they are children of light! Accursed is the people that kills "them which are sent" to be its saviours! The prophets are not all of Judea. There was one not born of Abraham and ignorant of Moses who could say to an offer of royal bribes and to the seduction of royal flattery, "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord to do either good or bad of mine own mind, but what the Lord saith that will I speak." There have been others of that lineage. If prophets were only foretellers of the future, the present could dispense with them, as for the most part it has for some time past. They are seers who report their vision, seeing far before, because by a special light they see far in; not only predicting events to come, but preparing for them, bringing them on or warding them off;

knowing what is to be because they know the nature of man, the laws of God, and the tendencies of hidden forces. A people puts out its eyes by suppressing them. It could better afford to reduce its revenues or to leave its gold mines closed.

Arguments being feeble and temper unmanageable, indiscreet disputants resort to calling bad names. The bad name for a Christian reformer, who naturally begins by pointing out that there is something to be reformed, is "pessimist." The value of a bad name depends, first, upon its power to disturb those to whom it is applied, and then upon the accuracy of its application. This opprobrious term is not very effective in either particular. In lexicography it is a misnomer; pessimism has been known in the history of speculations, ancient and modern. It is the theory that the plan of the universe is bad in itself, and that its on-goings are hopelessly bad, in fact, the worst possible. It is avowed or unavowed atheism. There is no God, or a Mephistophelian God, or else a God that blunders. The world is to be taken and endured stoically, or to be trifled with and laughed at with Epicurean gayety. Reformers have no place in it; philanthropists no opportunity; religion no foothold; suffering no hope. The attitude of the Christian prophet, on the other hand, who sees the wrongs and iniquities of society, exposes them in order that they may be remedied, denounces them in the name of Christ, conceals none of them, excuses none, apologizes for none, condones none for the sake of a political or religious party, for secular profit, for a salary or an office—this is the attitude, not of the pessimist, but of the real optimist. He does not say that things are well enough as they are, and are to be let alone; that is the real pessimism. He says that things are mixed, two forces contending; and he takes them as they are, to try with all his might, and with the help of as many as he can rally, to make them better. *Laissez faire* is pessimism. Indiscriminate, stolid conservatism is pessimism. We all know the posture, the calling, the cry, of the Hebrew prophets; how they looked at the national life, how they treated the administration or party in power, what their grandeur was and their glory, and why they were the heroic figures of ancient time. Were they pessimists? Was John Baptist a pessimist? We are not obliged to choose

between the soft theodicy of Leibnitz and the godless despair of Schopenhauer and Hartmann, but we are obliged to choose between a cowardly indifference on one side and a brave contest with wrong on the other. Metaphysical eudæmonism will not help us much; Buddhism will not help us at all. The Church at least is nothing if it is not a witness for him who put himself at the head of all reformers by confronting the self-satisfied, and by convincing the world that it must be set right because it is wrong. Better the truth-teller who uncovers what is bad to turn it into good, than the flatterer who calls evil good and lets it go from bad to worse.

It needs no very profound interpretation of history to see that the world's welfare in most times and places has been indebted to an order of men whose business has not been that of meddlesome disturbers or of wanton destructionists, but who have had singularly clear visions of moral distinctions and a strong hold on the throne of everlasting justice and judgment—men who have not undertaken to turn the world upside down, but who, finding it wrong side up, have done a great deal to turn it right side up; men who have called wrong things by their right names. On the whole, they have contributed as much toward the betterment of society as the capitalists and the "leaders of industry," the master manufacturers and the multipliers of money. American self-satisfaction has accumulated a vast literature of self-congratulation in a hundred years, and takes a juvenile pride in it. If a critic points out that growing abuses of wealth are as dangerous to the Republic as they are disgraceful to humanity, we are treated to a new picture of the prosperity of the country, with the sombre scenes left out.

A contributor to the FORUM, who has taught scholars and thinkers to expect of him a large treatment of grave subjects, in the course of a clever criticism of a popular fiction drops into this *laissez-faire* method. The beauties and blessings of life in these lively days are displayed quite in the manner of an old-fashioned thanksgiving sermon. Then there is a fresh presentation of the tiresome and transparent fallacy, that because creation exhibits countless differences and inequalities in things beyond human control, therefore society is bound to admit and admire

inequalities of the most unrighteous kind in things which are within its control. "One man is born in an age of barbarism, another in an age of civilization." But what we are dealing with now is an age, not of barbarism, but of professed civilization; why then should this truism be brought to rebuke an honest novel-writer who is trying to persuade his neighbors to clear out of our civilization, such as it is, a considerable mass of barbarous iniquity incidental to competitive conditions? "Why," it is asked, "is one animal the beast of prey, another the victim?" Nobody can tell, perhaps; but if this striking illustration has any logical pertinency to the argument, it must mean that our social "beasts of prey," in speculation and monopoly, are to be let alone and tolerated by their victims and by the lookers-on. "Why should one sentient creature be a worm and another a man?" This is not the question; but whether, being a man and not a worm, I may treat poorer men of fewer opportunities like worms, and make myself a hawk or a snake, instead of doing my best to get these unprivileged fellow creatures out of the worm condition. "Health, strength, beauty, intellect, offspring, length of days, are distributed with no more regard for justice than are the powers of making and saving wealth." Does this mean that no more responsibility attaches to the power of making and saving wealth than to the six preceding advantages? Does it mean that because some men and women are at a disadvantage in respect to those six natural things which they can do little or nothing to change, therefore there are no outrageous wrongs pertaining to the "powers of making and saving wealth" which conscience and law and society can check, and ought to check, by important measures tending to lessen inequality and to promote justice? "After all, there is more co-operation than competition in the industrial world as it now exists." Possibly; but suppose that competition and co-operation come into conflict, as they sometimes do, which will generally go to the wall? Will it be competition? There is a common maxim that "competition is the life of business." We understand that; but is that "business" of the kind that justice and humanity, honor and magnanimity, are most anxious to encourage? "Neither equal justice nor perfection of any kind is the law of the world, as the

world is at present, toward whatever goal we may be moving." Exactly; but can it not be seen that "the world, as the world is at present," is precisely what Christianity and Christ, the Church and the prophet, are on the earth to bring to judgment, righting its wrongs radically if need be, and making it over into a world that shall be in some sense or other the "kingdom of God"? "The advantages of combining Mr. Stewart's dry-goods establishment with Mr. Carnegie's iron works are not obvious at all." Agreed; yet if these establishments should produce their fine industrial and money-making results by a system of labor and wages which should subject a great number of men or women to physical exhaustion, mental starvation, social slavery, or political disability, yielding them less pay than their work is worth, then it must be obvious that they would be out of harmony with the divine order and with the highest interests of mankind.

One would suppose that by this time it might be tolerably plain that two opposite accounts of the existing social condition —order or disorder—neither of which is in itself so one-sided as to be really false, can be given, according as the purpose of the writer may be. We hold it to be self-evident that certain legitimate moral effects may be produced by a veracious exposure of the manifold mischiefs of class separation, such as inordinate wealth, luxury, indulgence, tyranny, and political corruption, damaging the very roots and sources of the government, on one side, with needless hardship, want, unwholesome living, physical, mental and moral deprivation, cruelty to women and children, intemperance, prostitution, ruin of self-respect, and a dwarfed intellectual development, on the other side. How sanguine writers expect to make confessed evils less prevalent or less destructive than they are, by insisting on our modern improvements, gains, and comparative comfort, on the beauties of competition, and on the magnificence of corporate enterprise, is not so clear. Surely there can be in the United States no rational terror of anarchy or revolution. As to strikes, local insurrections, interruptions of trade, and that class of calamities, they are quite as likely to be forestalled by a frank confession and reform of the injustices that provoke them, as by reiterated assurances that everything

is as it should be, that workingmen had better make up their minds that nature intended them for inferiority and subjection, and that nothing is really the matter. One is the way of "prophets of unrest," if you please; the other is the way of prophets of God.

We may glory in our civilization because it is glorious, or we may glory in it because it is ours. It is urged that in any civilization competition is a necessity, and that inequality is an unavoidable result of competition. Competition limited by justice and honor has been without doubt a civilizer. Competition unscrupulous, greedy, heedless of common rights as growing out of the common gifts of God and the provisions of nature, and so creating innumerable injustices, leads by a sure course to barbarism. That it has done so over and over again in the communities of East and West can be shown, and has been shown, by history. So Christianity is a necessity of civilization. Christianity is another name for justice and love. Its motive power is righteousness. The motive power of sheer competition is self-aggrandizement. To bring these into harmony is the practical problem of Christendom.

It may be said that the complaining class are to have no hearing and no relief from the rich and privileged, because the complainants are as well off as their predecessors in the same grade. They would be as well off but for their brains; for books, newspapers, and reading and debating clubs; and for the general stir of thought and awakening of ideas in civilized nations. Factory hands, hod-carriers, workers in mines, stokers, and seamstresses are not to blame for living in the nineteenth century. This "unrest" is born of the very social state which our competition and public schools and Declaration of Independence have brought about. You cannot boast of "enlightenment," and scold at the working classes for opening their eyes. in the same breath.

Some smooth eulogist of our social order may be supposed to have the conditions of his life so altered by circumstances, due in no manner to his own conduct or character, that he is an average specimen of the working class now under consideration. He is dependent on manual labor for a living, he is unemployed

and unknown, and his pocket is empty. He has a wife and children. With that sole equipment, "a pair of stout hands," which so many well-fed and well-clad students of the social problem consider an abundant outfit for happiness, he seeks employment. The first effect of the competitive system is that he finds about him men eager and anxious in the same pursuit, and before he gets a place he sees the scanty clothes of a hungry family wearing out, he has walked the streets of a city or of a factory town facing the humiliation of beggary, has persuaded some tradesmen to trust him in small sums for bread, and has made vague promises to the owner of the tenement where he is lodged. When he finally finds a job, with this load of debt upon him, he discovers that between stern necessity and a keen employer who believes that "business is business," his independence has gone into the bargain with his time and strength. Not only must he spend ten hours every day at his task, but all the terms of that task are subject to arbitrary dictation. In every particular of demand he must yield silently, bearing rudeness, exaction, and bad temper, or he must lose his situation. If he is required to take his pay in merchandise on which "the company" or the owner makes a profit, he must do it without complaint. If wages are kept back, he has in most cases no remedy, for in competition or in court what chance has the "hired man" against the millionaire? If there is a flaw in the thing made, or if measure or time is alleged to come short, the statement of the agent or employer against the workman must be accepted without appeal. If work on Sunday or in extra hours is demanded, it will go hard with him if he refuses. If it is directly or indirectly intimated to him that, in the exercise of the privilege of a "free citizen" he is expected to vote for the party or interest of the owner, he must do it in spite of his convictions. If he is in a straitened lot, where nothing can be accumulated; where, in sickness, he must forego medicine and a physician or run in debt for them; where every mental invigoration or refreshment is cut off, every taste for the beautiful is denied, thirst for knowledge is despised, education of children is made impossible, and life is in every way narrowed, depressed, and cramped; and if his wife or child is driven to the workshop, to be there overworked, under-

paid, taxed for thread, made answerable for losses, insulted, or turned off on account of a diminution of profits, redress is out of the question, and any allusion to it is dangerous. At every point where plenty of ready money would make living easy, he is taxed or cheated, because "the destruction of the poor is his poverty."

Now we say, without risk of contradiction, that an experience like this, brought over from the realm of imagination into reality, would be likely to darken by a good deal the bright pictures presented to us of the American paradise. The number of our human brothers who are in this pitiable plight, in every northern and western State, is not small, and in some sections must be reckoned by thousands. Apart from all material suffering, it is inevitable that a class spirit should be engendered, with its estranging and embittering ingredients. The manners become servile manners. *Noblesse oblige* amounts to nothing, because the superior power, being commercial and mercenary, is not *noblesse*. The friction is the more unhealthy as it becomes manifest that the distinction is not one of moral dignity, birth, or even breeding, but of cunning or chance. It is therefore anti-republican and anti-Christian. The purpose of the present writing is not to prove what disasters this false relation is preparing in the body politic, but what obligation it lays upon the Church. To a large extent it is denounced by the letter as well as by the spirit of the law of the Church's life. There we find such items as these: "Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth, and the cries of them which have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. Your gold and silver is cankered, and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire." "Do not ye after their works, for they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders, but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers." Will the prophets who so prophesy to-day have their sepulchres built and garnished by this generation?

Little is said here about measures or methods. The Church has little to say of them which has not been said from the beginning. These will appear as they are wanted when there are faith and wisdom and will to order and to regulate them. The

for p. 17 see page next front cover

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 4. JULY 1, 1895. PER ANNUM, $1.00. SINGLE NUMBERS, 10c.

THE INCARNATION

A Revelation of Human Duties.

A CHARGE DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY OF DURHAM IN THE CATHEDRAL, NOV. 17, AND IN THE CHAPEL OF AUCKLAND CASTLE, NOV. 19, 1892.

BY THE

RT. REV. BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D. D.,

Lord Bishop of Durham.

BOSTON.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

THE DIOCESAN HOUSE,

1895.

PUBLICATIONS.

The following papers have appeared, or will shortly appear, in the Publications of the Union. They may be had from the Secretary at ten cents each: Subscription, one dollar per annum.

SERIES A.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.
Rev. R. A. Holland, S.T.D.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY IN RELATION TO THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.
Rev. Prof. Cunningham, D.D.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH.
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D.

THE INCARNATION A REVELATION OF HUMAN DUTIES.
Rt. Rev. B. F. Westcott, D.D.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY FATHERS. (Two views.)

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
Joseph Mazzini.

AN ADDRESS BEFORE HARVARD UNIVERSITY.
Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D.D.

SERIES B.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE OF 1894.
Prof. W. J. Ashley, M.A.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIME.
Prof. Henry C. Adams, Ph.D.

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.
Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.

THE SLUMS OF GREAT CITIES AND THEIR PROBLEMS.
Rev. P. W. Sprague.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND PRACTICAL LIFE.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

THE HOUSING OF THE WORKING PEOPLE.
Rev. P. W. Sprague.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR STUDENTS.

AN EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

AMERICAN TRADES UNIONS.

These Publications are issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee; but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

THE INCARNATION

A Revelation of Human Duties.*

Before I enter on the discussion of the special subject which I propose to suggest for your consideration, I must offer you my cordial thanks for the care and thought which, with one or two exceptions, you have bestowed on the questions which I proposed to you. The replies which you have returned combine to give a vivid and minute view of the circumstances and the problems of the Diocese which it would not have been possible to obtain in any other way; and the knowledge which I have thus gained will serve to encourage and to guide me in whatever work I may hereafter be allowed to do. On future occasions, if the opportunity is given me, I hope to deal at length with some of the points which have been brought into prominence; but I should not do justice to my feeling if I did not now acknowledge with deep thankfulness the abundant proofs which I have received of the continued devotion and zeal of our clergy and lay-workers, and of the spirit of sympathy and fellowship by which their labors are supported. I do not wish to dwell to-day on external signs of local or general progress in our Church, or even on fundamental questions of ecclesiastical organization and politics. I wish rather at this season of most solemn reckoning to fix your attention and my own on the central point of our Faith, and to ask—in order that we may all ponder the thought in the presence of God—whether the fact of the Incarnation finds adequate expression in our opinions and in our conduct. The Incarnation, in proportion as we give a distinct meaning to the truth, must become to us a revelation of human duties, and it is in this light I invite you to regard it.

In approaching this overwhelming subject, I shall endeavor to fulfill a plan which I had already formed when I was called here, and which has been, as you know, present to my mind throughout my work in Durham. In the Diocesan Conference a year ago I touched upon the obligation which is laid upon the National Church, the spiritual organ of the Nation, to deal with the questions of common life in the light of the Christian Faith. I endeavored to show then that we have in the fact of the Incarnation, which it is our duty

---

By the kind permission of the author and publishers this charge is here reprinted from the Bishop of Durham's work entitled "The Incarnation and Common Life." New York. Macmillan & Co. 1893.

to proclaim, a motive adequate to stir us to resolute action, and strength adequate to support us in the face of difficulties apparently insuperable: that the vision of the patience of God is able to bring back confidence when we are disheartened by disappointments and delays: that as Christians, as Churchmen, we must strive unreservedly, clergy and laity alike, to make the Gospel the rule of our whole life in society and in the state, keeping before us the ideal of the one corporate life in Christ of which we have been made partakers: that we are bound not only to believe that "Jesus is Lord" but to confess Him before men: that it is the characteristic office of the clergy to present principles in the light of fresh experience, and of the laity to embody them with practical wisdom.

I wish now to pursue these thoughts a little further. I wish to point out, in the hope that some here present will pursue the different lines of reflection into the details of ordinary work, that the Incarnation of the Word of God becomes to us, as we meditate on the fact, a growing revelation of duties personal, social, national: that it is able by its all-pervading influence to mould to noblest ends the character of men and classes and peoples: that the interpretation of it in its bearings upon conduct with all that it brings of obligation and encouragement, is committed to us as ministers of the English Church with unique solemnity. For while we gladly recognize the services which other Communions render to the cause of righteousness, their labours cannot lessen our responsibility. They cannot, I repeat, lessen our responsibility, but they will, I trust, more and more help us to meet it.

The meaning of the Incarnation, the central event in the life of the world, the central truth in the experience of men, in which the seen and the unseen, the temporal and the eternal, the finite and the infinite, are brought together, is not obvious at once. The treasures of wisdom which the Incarnation includes will not be exhausted till humanity has reached its consummation. God sent forth His Son when the fullness of the time was come; and, from that date onward, the belief in the Word Incarnate has been a factor in human development, growing in power through further knowledge of life. For Christianity is not a speculation or a theory. It is historical in its preparation, in its essence, in its realization: the record and the interpretation of man's experience. The revelation which it brings is in life and of life. The Faith, in which it is embodied and through which it acts, grows as humanity grows. Each age is bound to study afresh the central fact and to trace the broadening stream of its consequences. Each age has its special problems for which the Gospel has a special message. Men cannot recall the past and live by it. Nor again can they separate themselves from the past. What our fathers did makes our work possible and in part determines it. Under this aspect the work of each

generation is disclosed by their circumstances, and we cannot mistake our own. We are required to prove our Faith in the wider fields of social life. The currency of the general conception of evolution enables us to understand much in the course of religious movements which was obscure before, and to foresee more clearly coming changes. Christianity, even when it is most individualistic, must affect society, though it may be silently. But now, in England, social questions are definitely raised as never before, and they tend to become paramount. As this age has been an age of physical science so the next is likely to be an age of social science.

It is then of vital importance that we, as ministers of the Church, should approach social problems from a Christian point of sight. If we believe in the Fall and the Redemption and the Mission of the Spirit, the belief, so far as the belief is realized, must affect our judgments, our actions, our hopes. And we must vindicate our belief in deed; for as Christians we hold, and all experience goes to confirm our conviction, that we are not set on earth to contemplate passively an evolution wrought out about us and in us, but to be soldiers on a battle-field, charged to prepare and hasten the coming of the Lord. Further knowledge of the conditions by which our action is limited does not lessen the claims of duty but tends to guide us to more fruitful endeavors. A vivid perception of a purpose surely fulfilled according to our observation does not deprive us of childly trust in Him Who works before our eyes. The observed facts of evolution do not dispense with the thought of God. Nay rather, they postulate His action—to speak in the language of men—as the simplest hypothesis to explain, or more truly to describe intelligibly, the progress which they represent. But at the same time they suggest that something has impeded and marred the course of the progress which they establish. There is, when we regard events on a large scale, a growing order: that is a witness—to speak again in the language of men—to the wisdom and love of a Sovereign Will. There is, when we look for the moment without us and within us, an unceasing conflict: that is the witness to man's self-assertion. Fixing our thoughts upon humanity, we see with increasing clearness, when we contemplate our powers, our aspirations, our failures, an ideal towards which we are made to strain; and experience shows that by ourselves we cannot reach it. None the less we persist in our effort; and the Gospel comes to encourage and to sustain us.

But that we may find and use the power of the Gospel, we must realize it in its whole essence and scope. We are not Theists. Our commission is not simply to call on men to believe in God, but to believe in God manifested in the flesh. By the Incarnation God is revealed to us as "the Father," so as to give validity to our human conceptions of His perfection. By the Incarnation He enters

through His Son into the world of Nature and delivers us from the tyranny of materialism. By the Incarnation He makes known to us the spiritual basis of life in virtue of which man in the fullness of his nature is shown to be capable of fellowship with God.

But while the Incarnation "brings all heaven before our eyes," it guards us from a dreamy mysticism. It hallows labor and our scene of labor. It claims the fullest offering of personal service. It embraces all men in the range of its greatest hope, and not only those who have reached a particular stage of culture. It enables us to reverence with a sublime faith, which experience has amply justified, men as men; for we believe that *Christ is the Saviour of the world* (St. John iv. 42): that it is the will of God *that all men be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth* (1 Tim. ii. 4): that it was *His good pleasure to reconcile through Christ all things unto Himself having made peace through the blood of His cross, whether the things on the earth or the things in the heavens* (Col. i. 20).

All men and all being therefore come within the range of the Christian's hope; and our most frequent prayer—*Thy kingdom come*—reminds us that the Lord presents earth as the scene of our consummation. As His ambassadors we need to assert His claim to be Creator and Heir of the universe (Heb. i. 2). The apostolic portraiture of the Master, as *He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil* (Acts x. 38), must be the pattern of the disciples' labors. To us also, when we are lost in vain speculations on the mysteries of the Divine working, the words come: *Why stand ye gazing up into heaven?* (Acts i. 11).

We need this awakening summons to that which we may think secular work. It has happened now and again that our hesitation has prejudiced the popular estimate of our Faith. There is unhappily a true sense in which the common people have not heard us gladly. They think, however wrongly, that we are either ignorant of their trials or indifferent to them. In the meantime, while we have hung back, others have sought to bring expression and fulfillment to the generous desires of our race. Their work has been outwardly Christian in type, but they have lacked the spiritual foundation of the Christian Faith. Where they have failed, and all merely material reforms must fail, their ill-success has tended to discredit our efforts. It cannot but discredit them until we make our motive and our aim clear. This we can do and this we are bound to do. For us each amelioration of man's circumstances is the translation of a fragment of our Creed into action, and not the self-shaped effort of a kindly nature. It answers, as we believe, to the Will of God; and the Faith which quickened the purpose is sufficient to accomplish it. Our Perfect Exemplar exists already. Our citizenship—the type of every social privilege and duty—exists

in heaven (Phil. iii. 20). That ideal underlies, limits, transfigures, our earthly citizenship. For us "love" is no vague impulse, but the mature fruit of that "love of the brethren," which grows out of the common acknowledgment by Christians of their vital union with one Saviour (2 Pet. i. 7). The "brother" in the Epistles of St. John, whose language has been transferred to attractive commonplaces, is the fellow-Christian and not the fellow-man. The truth which the Apostle emphasized is consequently in danger of being forgotten. We all need to recognize more fully than we have yet done the Divine fellowship of Christian with Christian before we can rightly discharge our wider duties.

For we all have wider duties. The capacity for influence is given to us, and we are charged to use it. Under three memorable images the Lord describes the office of Christians and of the Christian Church to men at large. *Ye are*, He said to His disciples gathered round Him, *the salt of the earth: Ye are the light of the world.* And again, *The kingdom of heaven is like to leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened.*

Every phrase requires to be carefully weighed. In the ministry of the Gospel there is work for the individual; and there is work for the society. There is a work of preservation, of enlightenment, of transformation. Things in themselves corruptible and transitory receive from Christians in Christ that which brings to them soundness and permanence. Dark mysteries in society and nature are illuminated for believers, who are commissioned to spread the light which they welcome. The unordered mass of human energies is capable of transfiguration, and the Christian Society, so far as it is faithful to itself, silently and slowly extends on every side its quickening force. The Incarnation—to connect these duties with their source—carries with it all that is requisite for the fulfillment of the Divine counsel of creation: the power of the Resurrection, the glory of the Ascended Christ, the life which He breathed into His Church.

The fact, as I have already said, is slowly apprehended. The consequences are slowly realized. Yet there is a movement towards the divine goal. The conquests of the first three centuries—the successive conquests of the family, the schools, the empire—typify on the scene of the Old World the conquests which have to be won on a much larger scale in the New World. Something has been already done, but we have still much to learn in order that we may do our part.

Christian ideals have not yet taken a dominant place in our higher education; though I believe that it is becoming more and more clear that these alone satisfy the aspirations of the masters of ancient Greece and bring into life the theories which they formed apart from life.

In social action we are all tempted to acquiesce in that which is "lawful." We consider what we may "lawfully" do without incurring civil penalties and not what we ought to do. But civil law is no rule of positive duty. Its symbol is "thou shalt not" and not "thou shalt." And for the inspiration of conduct we require to consider what a quickened sense of duty prompts us to aim at, rather than what a code forbids.

In international affairs a narrow "patriotism" often hinders us from looking at the permanent issues of a policy suggested by present interests or pride.

We have then, I say, much to learn. The Christian Faith covers all life—the personal life, the life of the citizen and the life of the man. Each least and nearest interest gains in intensity as a wider interest is acknowledged. As Christians therefore we are bound ourselves to study and, as far as we may be able, to lead others to study the Christian ideal of our personal relations, of our class relations, of our national relations; and then to determine the next step which we can take in each direction towards it. This is the thought which I desire to master and enforce. The Church of Christ has still the right, or rather the duty, of "binding and loosing," of declaring with authority what must and what must not be done. The commission given to the Apostles may have been allowed to fall into abeyance but it has never been revoked. It can be exercised in other ways and more effectively than by the decrees of Councils. That it should be exercised is a pressing need of an age when all men alike claim freedom of judgment and have equal political power. That we in our measure may be enabled to exercise it, we must seek anew the insight, the faith, the courage, which a vital acceptance of the Incarnation will bring to us.

I.

A modern writer commences a sombre essay on the prospects of humanity with these words: "A ruined temple, with its fallen columns and broken arches, has often been taken as a suggestive type of the transitory nature of all human handiwork. . . . Soon the building follows the builder to an equal dust, and the universal empire of Death alone survives over the tombs of departed glory and greatness." In this view nothing is suggested beyond man's effort and man's failure. The same image is used by one of the greatest Puritans of the 17th century and made radiant with hope. "The stately ruins," Howe writes of the soul of man, "are visible to every eye, that bear in their front, yet extant, this doleful inscription: *Here God once dwelt.* Enough appears of the admirable frame and structure to show the Divine presence did sometime reside in it. . . . The lamps are extinct, the altar overturned: the light and love are now vanished, which did the one shine with so heavenly brightness, the other burn with so pious

fervour." Perhaps we may think that even here the picture is too darkly painted; but, though it be so, Howe goes on to show how God, Who had designed that first temple, completed through the Incarnate Word the work which He had begun. Thus we are raised above man both in the conception and in the consummation of his powers.

The two passages bring out vividly the contrast between the non-Christian and Christian idea of humanity. For the non-Christian there can be no certainty of assurance in the prospect of the desolations of the world. For the Christian, the Incarnation proclaims that the Gospel of Creation has been fulfilled in fact and moves forward to a complete accomplishment. The first words which the Lord taught His disciples to use, "Father" (Lk. xi. 2), "Our Father, which art in heaven" (Matt. vi. 9), express briefly what the Incarnation has wrought for us as men. They invest us with a privilege of divine sonship which finds no place in the Old Testament. The words are a prophecy, an interpretation, a promise. They point to a personal relation between God and man which each man is set to realize in life; they show that we share this potentially with all other men; and the fact that Christ charges us to claim the double fellowship, fellowship with God ("Father") and fellowship with man in God ("*our* Father"), is an assurance that through His help we can obtain it. So then we face our work, sons of God, brothers of men; and this double master-thought—one thought in two aspects—will help us in dealing with our personal duties in regard to ourselves and in regard to others, as heirs of God's love and called to fulfill a human ministry.

It is indeed impossible to draw a sharp line between these two spheres of personal and social effort and action. It is impossible for anyone to confine the effects of what he does or leaves undone to himself alone. If he withdraws himself into a desert and spends his years in completest isolation, he defrauds his fellow-men of the fruits of the large heritage which he has received from the past. In the stir of action every man at every moment influences others, consciously or unconsciously, limiting and moulding them, scattering seeds of thought and deed which will be fruitful of good or evil while time lasts. If the solitary ascetic is to justify himself he must show—and there are times perhaps when this would be possible—that his impressive protest against the spirit of his age is worth the cost at which it is made. If the man of affairs is to justify his life of restless enterprise, he must not appeal to material results but to the signs of character strengthened and purified. The responsibility of living might well appal us by its immeasurable issues, but as children we can rest gladly in our Father's will. This then is that which we are constrained to seek for in our personal relations through our faith in the Incarnation, a recognition of common

divine Sonship and "equal" spiritual brotherhood. It is a familiar claim; but perhaps it has lost much of its force because we have ceased to reflect upon it ourselves and to press it upon others. We assume that the claim is acknowledged, and we neglect to consider the fact by which it is established. For when seen in this light, as the application to men individually of the message that *the Word became flesh*, the assertion of the Divine sonship of each man, of the human brotherhood of all men in Christ, is fitted to chasten, to guide, to inspire us: to furnish at once a solid foundation and a touchstone for our theories of social intercourse. Just so soon and so far as we regard ourselves and others "in Christ," to use St. Paul's phrase, according to the Divine counsel, we shall strive to secure for each man, as for ourselves, the opportunity of fulfilling his part in a divine society, for developing a corresponding character, for attaining in his measure to the Divine likeness. The apostolic picture will be constantly before us as our charter and our law: *There is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye were called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism: one God and Father of all, Who is over all, and through all and in all* (Eph. iv. 4–6), ruling, uniting, sustaining.

The fundamental image of "the body" guards us from many errors. The rich energy of the whole depends on the variety of the parts. There can be no physical or intellectual or moral equality among men as the members of the Body of Christ. Each man has his own peculiar function. Each man is heir of one past and has some unique heritage to administer and to hallow. The opportunity which we seek for him is not the opportunity of doing anything, but of doing that one thing which answers to his individuality and his place. As he does this he enters on the enjoyment of the fullness of the greater life to which he has contributed. Regarded under this aspect—the aspect of our Christian Faith—life is an opportunity for service. We are not our own. We were not only redeemed by Christ: we were bought by Him and are His. The essence of sin lies in selfishness, self-assertion (πλεονεξία). Brought to this test the great questions of temperance and purity can be dealt with effectually. The virtues are positive and not negative. They are not personal but social. Any indulgence which lessens our own efficiency, or brings injury on another, is sinful. St. Paul has laid down the principles: *If because of meat thy brother is grieved, thou walkest no longer in love. Destroy not with thy meat him for whom Christ died. . . . Overthrow not for meat's sake the work of God* (Rom. xiv. 15, 20). And again: *Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ? shall I then take away the members of Christ and make them members of a harlot?* (1 Cor. vi. 15). Our work will be permanently effective when we rest on these fundamental thoughts. The most far-reaching arguments, the highest motives, are the most practical. No self-centered con-

siderations will shield a man in temptation. But the vision of Christ will, for He will support the effort that is made in acknowledgment of a duty which is owed to Him.

False-dealing in trade and gambling can, I believe, only be overcome by the application of the same truth. They are offences against our fellowship in Christ. We must present them in this light. Nor will anyone think that such a view is exaggerated who has reflected on the reason which St. Paul gives for truthfulness. *Speak ye truth*, he writes, *each one with his neighbor*, *because we are members one of another* (Eph. iv. 25).

I touch on these most obvious points for I think that we commonly shrink from bringing the great truths of our Faith to bear on the trials and duties of every day. Yet commonplace events make up the staple of our lives. Our ordinary occupations must form nine-tenths of our service—our service to God and to man—and if the power of our Faith is to be felt, we require not only private devotion but open confession (1 John iv. 3). The obligation lies on the layman no less than on the clergyman. Those who believe must act as believing and because they believe. If they do so, experience tells us that they will speedily influence public opinion; and at the same time they will themselves learn to trust more resolutely to the efficacy of spiritual forces. Life, I have said, is an opportunity for service. The way of the Master is the way of the disciple, and for the most part we are in a position in which the discipline and sense of service are natural. We have no difficulty in looking to our day's work, as it is given to us day by day, as something to be done for God's glory and man's welfare in our Father's presence and through His help. So it is with the bulk of our middle class. It is otherwise with the very rich and with the very poor. In this respect extremes meet, and it is hard to say whether superfluity or penury is more unfavorable to the realization of the true idea of life. On the one side the pressure of conventional engagements and pleasures tends to crowd out the thoughts of service: on the other side the conditions of labor are such as to obscure the truth that this labor may be the service of a son.

Such contrasts, such hindrances to the Christian life, demand consideration. They raise problems which we are called to face. They involve perils against which we are bound to provide. They furnish tests of the sincerity and power of our faith. Has the parable of the manna no application here?

It is true that there can be no "equal" participation in wealth or in any concrete "good" consistent with due regard to the various capacities of men: true that the highest good of society as a whole, taking account of the future, depends on some measure of inequality in opportunities and means, corresponding to inequalities of power; true that wealth accumulated in private hands has unique power for

conferring common benefits : true that a certain outward magnificence befits great offices : true that the adequate fulfillment of some duties requires exceptional provisions. But while we admit this to the full, there is a wide agreement that the present distribution of wealth in England is unfavorable to the highest general well-being of the country : that it is as perilous to the moral excellence of those who have in excess as to that of those who have not what they need : that it is unfavorable to healthy consumption by developing fictitious wants : that it establishes material wealth as the standard of success ; that it tends to destroy the practical sense of the divine sonship and the spiritual brotherhood of men. Such a judgment demands anxious consideration. It may not be possible to secure at present a better distribution of wealth among us. Violent changes, we have learnt from the past, would work no lasting good. But at least we can endeavor to determine the causes which have produced and are continuing to produce a dangerous inequality, and to ascertain how they can be modified.

In the meantime there is abundant scope for private efforts on our part to secure a simpler type of living. We can habitually ask ourselves whether this or that exceptional indulgence is required for the efficiency of our service, and press the question upon others. We can at the same time endeavor to raise the standard of life among the poor. We can, using the lessons of our own experience, strive to bring back employers to live among their own people. We can multiply opportunities for sympathetic intercourse. We can perhaps do something to check the wastefulness of fashion which stimulates vanity and provokes imitation. We can help those who look only on the surface of things to understand something of the burden of great possessions. We can show that we wish to use all whereby God has made us to differ from others not for the assertion of our superiority but for better service, *not saying that aught of the things which we possess is our own.*

Such duties lie upon us first. The clergy have exceptional knowledge of the circumstances of the poor, and, through that knowledge, exceptional motives for endeavoring to secure them a stable and honorable position. They have at the same time natural opportunities for meeting the wealthy. These opportunities they are bound to use for the accomplishment of their ministry. At the same time they are under no obligation which is not equally binding on the laity, and they need at every point lay counsel and co-operation. Such sympathy and help they must claim in the interest of all alike.

It is a commonplace that Christianity has recognized the dignity of manual labor, as true service of children of God. But can we show that we have carried the conviction into life? Can we show —I do not say that the influence of our Faith in drawing Christians ogether is stronger, with a simple and natural dominance, than the

influences of class and education and taste in separating them, but —that the acknowledgment of brotherhood in Christ leads the mass of our countrymen to inquire into the conditions under which the majority of those whom they call brethren actually live? How few, for example, realize the moral and physical dangers of different kinds of employments. How few take account of the cost at which their necessary wants are satisfied, or their amusements provided. How few pause to estimate the loss of life in many occupations which might be prevented if only attention were fixed upon the facts, and the resources of science patiently brought to bear upon the problems which they suggest. An American writer ventured to say that railways are laid on men for sleepers. Even this exaggeration will repay reflection.

For it is to the simplest and the broadest aspects of the life of the poor and not to accessories that attention ought to be directed, to the hours of work rather than to the hours of recreation.

A man's daily labor is the chief element in determining his character. It is by this he serves, and by this he grows. It is substantially his life, to be begun and ended, day by day, in the name of God. Thus the labor question is in the fullest sense a religious question. The workman is commonly said to offer his work in the market as a commodity. In fact he offers himself. If then the conditions of labor are not such as to make a true human life possible for the laborer, if he receives as the price of his toil a mutilated and impoverished manhood, there can be no lasting peace; there can be no prevailing Christian Faith. For a true human life the essential external requisites are adequate food, shelter, leisure, and provision for incapacity or old age. Are we English Churchmen—clergy and laity alike—satisfied that, speaking generally, these are found among our poorer artisans? Nay rather, is it not too plain that they are not found? It is stated on good authority that only one-third of our population are able to live in decent comfort. It is certain that great numbers have no reserve of means, and are unable to make adequate provision for incapacity or old age.

I have no wish to exaggerate the shadows of modern life. "There are two ways," it has been most wisely said, "of looking even at mere figures. . . ." It may "with some show of reason be regarded as not so very bad that a tenth of the population should be reckoned as very poor in a district so confessedly poverty-stricken as East London; but when we count up the 100,000 individuals, the 20,000 families, who lead so pinched a life among the population described, and remember that there are in addition double that number, who if not actually pressed by want, yet have nothing to spare, we shrink aghast from the picture." Still we must calmly face it; and we have yet to learn how far it represents the condition of our own great towns, of Sunderland and Gateshead, of Shields

and Hartlepool, of Darlington and Stockton. To contemplate such a state of things even afar off is surely to be constrained to leave nothing undone to amend it, relying on God's will for His people, and the unexhausted and untried resources of the Gospel.

There was a time when Economists would have said that such an effort was hopeless. Wider experience has taught us another lesson. The institutions of society and the motives of men which determine the facts summarily described as "economic laws" are liable to alteration. Forms of inheritance, of land-tenure, of cultivation, of industrial processes and remuneration, influence the distribution of wealth. These have been changed in the past, and are still liable to change. On the other hand men are stirred to energetic action by other impulses than the hope of gain. And these may be called hereafter into wider play. The power of love, the power of the Incarnation, has hitherto hardly been invoked as the sovereign principle of Christian action.

We are bound, as teachers, to consider social problems in their largest range, but our own peculiar duties lie within a definite region. And however widespread the evils may be with which we have to contend, our part can best be done by dealing with them locally as they are found among us, by patient personal intercourse, guided by intelligent sympathy. At present our strength and the strength of our fellow-workers is dissipated in fragmentary and spasmodic and ill-proportioned efforts. The first requisite for steady and continuous work is full knowledge of the facts; and I trust that some combined endeavor will be made, with as little delay as possible, to ascertain in detail the facts as to the housing of the poor in the Diocese of Durham—and in this I would include the provisions on shipboard for our seafaring people—their methods of purchase, their hours of labor, their provision for old age: how far existing laws are known or enforced: how far existing helps are used. I do not ask the clergy to undertake these wide enquiries. They are already overburdened. But I ask that they invite the laity to undertake them. Every parish can help. Many who are not of our own communion will, I believe, heartily co-operate in a work in which all Englishmen are alike interested. And when the facts are known, I believe that those who differ on many points will find ways opened for hearty fellowship in solving the problems which they suggest.

In seeking your help, your help as ministers of Christ, for obtaining the exact knowledge of the material condition of those who are committed to your charge, as the basis for necessary reforms, I do not confound the external conditions of good with good. I do not suppose that material improvements can regenerate men or that outward well-being can satisfy them. But I do say that we cannot realize what our Faith is, or teach others to realize it, unless we strive according to our opportunities to secure for those whom we

acknowledge to be children of God and members of Christ opportunities of self-development and service corresponding to our own. I do say that it is the office of those to whom the message of the Gospel is entrusted to make it known in its apostolic breadth and power. I do say that certain outward conditions must be satisfied before a true life can be enjoyed: that our life is one and that each part affects the whole: that, if the conditions of labor for the young are such as to tend necessarily to destroy the effects of a brief and crowded education, if the energies of men are exhausted by a precarious struggle for food and shelter, if there is no quiet leisure for thought, if the near future is clouded, as often as thought is turned to it, it is vain to look for a vital welcome of the Faith which deals with the future through the present, and claims the life that now is as well as that which is to come. The teaching of the Lord on spiritual reformation, like the teaching of the prophets, was accompanied by active solicitude for the external bettering of the multitudes *distressed and scattered as sheep not having a shepard* (Matt. ix. 36). At the same time the Gospel must be preached in its spiritual simplicity and directness and power. Sin must be shown to be the spring of sorrows and the sting of death. He to whom we appeal as a child of God, must be led to his Father, he whom we claim as a brother, must be taught to look to Christ, through Whose Life and Death and Resurrection validity has been given to the title. The power to which we appeal is a Divine kinship. Till this is acknowledged with its corresponding duties our work is not done.

So far I have spoken only of single workers—of the relation of man to man, as sons of God and brethren, but the family and not the man is the unit of humanity; and it is a significant fact that the first converts in Europe were families "Lydia and her household," and "the jailor and all his." In our schemes of reform the family has too often been forgotten; though we need, I think above all things to labor for the restoration or development of simple family life. Legislative changes have tended to weaken the sense of home responsibility. Many popular institutions break up the fellowship of the hearth. If it be said that such fellowship is impossible, I can only answer that if it be so, our state is condemned. It is in the family that the future of a people is shaped. Each true home is a kingdom, a school, a sanctuary. The thirty years of silent unnoticed labor at Nazareth teach us, if we ponder over the meaning, what the home may be and in God's counsel is.

The lessons and the duties of the family belong to the rich in some sense even more than to the poor. But indeed every thought on which I have touched concerns, if it be in different ways rich and poor alike. Every question which I have raised claims an answer from every Christian first in the silence of the soul and then in the market-place and in the council chamber. The equal dignity, the

equal destiny of man as man is a thought due to the Gospel which each generation has to master in dealing with its own problems. Differences of culture or place or wealth are opportunities for characteristic service. They exist only for the welfare of the body, for the fullness of the life in which every member shares. Among Christians *there can be*, St. Paul tells us in comprehensive language which covers the great types of distinction among us, race, social condition, sex, *neither Jew nor Greek*, *there can be neither bond nor free*, *there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus* (Gal. iii. 28).

II.

Hitherto I have considered only our personal relations one to another under the necessary conditions of life. We are at our birth severally members of a family. We are to the end citizens of a state. No seclusion can free us from the responsibility of influence. Our life is from first to last social. As Christians we are "one man in Christ Jesus," and in this fellowship we gain the unity which is prepared for all.

Recognizing this larger life I have endeavored to show that our Faith constrains us to strive after the realization of our brotherhood with our fellows and to secure our own highest good by using our special endowments for the general welfare: to seek for others as for ourselves the opportunity of most effective service: to endeavor to understand truly the circumstances and feelings of those who depend on us and on whom we depend: to recognize that we are "our brothers' keepers."

But if we regard society at large we see that groups of men are differenced no less than individuals; and the fundamental harmonies of the home lead us to expect that these differences will be permanent. As it is, the nation consists not only of citizens and families, but also of classes. These are shaped and bound together by a common history, by common traditions, interests, duties; and they represent permanent types of service. Philosophers who have framed ideal commonwealths have recognized that the coexistence of distinct classes is necessary for the general well-being. Early rulers stereotyped them and fenced them round with impassible barriers, though it is a lesson of hope that in the oldest and most permanent Empire in the world free passage from class to class has always been allowed. Going back then to the image of the body, we can truly say that as the nation is one body, so, on this larger scale, the different classes are members of it. That which holds good of the whole Church, holds good of the Christian nation: *all the body fitly framed and knit together*, *through that which every joint supplieth*, *according to the working in due measure of each several part*, *maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love*.

Here then again as Christians we are bound to seek for the

greatest human efficiency of each class as of each man: to seek that each class shall fulfill its office under conditions which are favorable not only to life but to good life. In the Christian state every group of workers ought to be able to take a recognized and honorable place in the whole body. So the social aspect of work will bring to all work equal dignity.

It has been said that states grow rich only by labor, even as character is rightly shaped by it. The statement is true in the material sense if we take account of the past no less than of the present; of intellectual, moral and spiritual labor no less than of manual labor. But the workman becomes less and less able to claim any result as his own according as society becomes more and more complex. All work depends on fellowship and serves to support it. If we look to the essential relations of things, the material reward of work is the provision that it may be done: the end of work is the general welfare. The true wealth of states is men and not merchandise. The true function of government is to watch over the growth of good citizens. Material wealth exists for the development of man not man for the acquisition of property. This principle has in fact hitherto ruled our social legislation, which has been influenced more by moral than by economic considerations. Our legislation has been, in other words, essentially if unconsciously Christian; and now our aim as believers in the Divine life of the nation must be to secure, as far as possible, that our national inheritance shall be made fruitful as it is distributed in many parts throughout the people, and that each worker shall be able to thank God for the joy of his own task and the share which he has in the common life. To this end we shall not seek to equalize material riches but to hallow large means by the sense of large responsibility: not to palliate the effects of poverty but to remove the causes of it: not to dispense with strenuous and even painful effort but to provide that labor in every form may be made the discipline of noble character.

If we look around we must confess that we have hardly faced the problem which is thus set before us. We have just emerged from an industrial revolution. Old ties have been removed. The new ties have not yet been shaped. The spirit of individualism is still invoked to justify boundless self-assertion; and even self-interest is insufficient to restrain ruinous competition. Such anarchy can only last for a brief space. Already we welcome on every side generous if impatient efforts to establish among us a social order more conformable to the facts of Divine sonship and human brotherhood. Nor need we be disheartened if discontent increases at the time when there is a growing desire to remove the evils by which it is aroused. Education cannot but stir new wants by awakening new capacities; and if these take a material form at first, it is because we have not shown that the highest and most satisfying pleasures are independent of great possessions.

What then shall we do as ministers of Christ—this is the question which we have to ask—to hasten the advent of the better order? How shall we in the exercise of our office prepare the ready acceptance of new duties answering to the new conditions of capital and labor, of owners, employers and artisans?

The first and the most obvious answer is that we shall use our unique power for promoting mutual understanding between different classes. We touch, as I have said, each extreme in the social scale. We have the opportunity of knowing directly with what disastrous issues words, motives, feelings, are misinterpreted on this side and that. Our greatest industrial danger lies in the want of mutual confidence between employers and employed. Confidence is of slow growth. It comes most surely through equal intercourse. This in some forms we can further. We are above the suspicion of partisanship. We can encourage the fullest expression of opinion from the advocates of rival causes. We can sometimes invite an interchange of conflicting views.

But it is through fellowship in the highest work that we learn best how much those have in common who seem to be most widely separated by circumstances. And after thirty-five years I look with growing trust for the formation of little bands of Christian workers in every Diocese or even in every Rural Deanery united for common service—"brethren and sisters of the common hope"—taken from every class, who by fellowship in aim and labor and devotion shall bring together many hearts.

Such associations, growing out of our own circumstances and needs and aspirations, not artificial imitations of brotherhoods framed to meet the conditions of earlier times, would, I believe, interpret the Faith with a new power and reveal believers to themselves. They belong no less to a highly developed than to a primitive form of Christian society. They belong especially to periods of great change, and bring satisfaction to the spirit of sacrifice and the spirit of devotion which these tend to awaken. If the leader arise among us, followers will not be wanting.

Everything seems to be ready for the new beginning. Meanwhile we shall use—or endeavor to use—every opportunity which is offered to us in ordinary life for learning the feelings and aims of employers and employed, and for bringing both classes together on the ground of the common Faith.

Free and habitual intercourse between them, both personally and through their accredited representatives, will prepare the way for a satisfactory and lasting settlement of the relative claims of capital and labor on the profits of industry. It is needless to speculate on the form which it is likely to take. But already a great change has taken place in the provision of capital for industrial enterprises, which, since it brings special dangers and opportunities, requires to be noticed. The largest businesses are more and more

falling into the hands of Joint Stock Companies. It is said that these already engross one-third of the commerce of England. In this sense very many of us are capitalists, not as lenders of money merely, but as partners in some industrial undertaking, sharing its fortunes and responsibilities, though we are not directly engaged in it.

The position is one which calls for serious consideration. A divided responsibility is in all cases difficult to discharge, but in this case the responsibility is so widely spread that it is practically forgotten. Shares in great companies are regarded simply as investments (like loans) without any duties of proprietorship. The whole business, with its complicated human relationships, tends to become a profit-making machine. The discussions at the Annual Meetings turn mainly upon the dividend. Expenditure which is not directly remunerative is viewed with suspicion or disfavor.

Here, then, it rests with us to apprehend ourselves and to enforce, as far as we are able, a juster view of the obligations of shareholders. We can feel the temptation, and we can feel the opportunity. The share in a business, small as it may be, carries with it not only responsibility for the capital as property but also responsibility for the administration of it. The holder is both a trustee in regard to the sum which the shares represent, and an agent in regard to the end for which it is employed. It is his duty to satisfy himself that his money will be put to a good use, and so made to contribute to ends which are materially and morally desirable. He is bound, that is, to consider both the object of the enterprise to which he contributes and the manner in which it is conducted: to consider, in other words, the character and the conditions of the work, and even the more remote results which it may produce. The amount of the dividend, irrespective of the way in which it is earned, cannot justify his choice of the investment. He is required, as one who knows that he has received all for the common good, not only to offer duly of that which he receives, but also to be assured in his own mind that what he has is rightly employed.

The influence of a single shareholder may be slight, but even one who supports the Directorate in endeavoring to improve the conditions of labor and give those who serve an interest in the prosperity which they help to create, will direct attention to a principle and call out sympathetic support. A wide proprietorship ought to secure steady and generous consideration for workmen, and provide in due time for those larger forms of co-operation in which many see the best hope for the future.

On the other hand, the common indifference of shareholders to the conduct of that which is their own business, if only it is financially successful, and their personal ignorance of the work by which they profit, gives plausibility to the popular charge that the capitalist uses the artisan for his own gain.

These considerations are, I repeat, of great and far-reaching importance; and we need to weigh them both for the guidance of our own action and for the wise counselling of those who seek our advice.

It may be urged that I am pleading to a large extent for a sentiment: that the Directorates of our greatest Companies are alive to their duties, and that skilled labor is able to maintain its own cause successfully. Yet sentiment has a dominant effect on life and character; and it makes a difference whether a result is obtained by conflict or by concert. There are also larger possibilities in the administration of great Companies to which I have pointed as deserving attention; and there is even among skilled artisans a proportion of partially unemployed whose case is peculiarly sad. But at the same time I readily admit that the most pressing social difficulty now lies in the condition of irregular and unskilled laborers. To them we naturally turn our thoughts chiefly, for they most need help. They have suffered most acutely from the industrial revolution. They have the least capacity for combination, and the least opportunity for combining. They seem to be as yet unable to rise to a higher standard of life by their own efforts. They do not even aspire to it. Education has not stirred in them a generous discontent. They suffer in moral force from labor which is uncertain and unnaturally protracted, and the value of their labor is seriously lessened. As far as I can yet judge, they require some extended legislative protection, and, I will venture to add, some legislative coercion. There are classes which are still children, and in their case the Government must not shrink from discipline. It cannot rightly leave uncorrected and unrestrained masses of men whose low type of life spreads corruption. It treats attempted suicide as a crime: it ought to treat "the slow suicide of idleness" as a crime no less.

Labor refuges and labor colonies, both at home and abroad, may be of good service. The experiments in Holland and Germany give warnings and encouragements. But we have yet much to learn. We have to determine particularly the right limits of public and private efforts, of coercive discipline and personal influence, and without advocating at present any special solution of the problem, I plead that we should seriously study it. England brought the problem upon us, and England must solve it. For us Durham is our school. And it will be possible, I trust, to form groups of laymen, who will patiently study its lessons: who will inquire and consult and teach: who will ascertain the number and the descent and the distribution of the skilled and unskilled: who will determine the extent and the causes of the rapid shifting of the population in some places: who will investigate in detail the causes of the pauperism which exists in the Diocese: who will trace for us in the history of the last fifty years the great lines of improvement

along which we can move further with the confidence of faith.

I fully recognize the difficulties of bringing class to class in harmonious fellowship, and above all of finding a worthy place in the social body for the lowest class: but here the Gospel sustains us. For the most desolate Christ died. They, too, are part of the world which God loved. That devotion to the common good through which alone men as men can be bound together in widest and closest communion is necessarily included in the Christian Faith. And what we look for, work for, pray for, as believers, is a nation where class shall be bound to class by the fullest participation in the treasures of the one life: where the members of each group of workers shall find in their work the development of their character and the consecration of their powers; where the highest ambition of men shall be to be leaders of their own class, so using their special powers without waste and following the common traditions to nobler issues: where each citizen shall know, and be strengthened by the knowledge, that he labors not for himself only, nor for his family, nor for his country, but for God.

Such a nation, "framed and fitly joined together by that which every joint supplieth," rising out of the past, new at once and yet old, would rightly embody the social spirit of Christ and prepare the Advent of the Kingdom of God.

Is it not worth working for? And will not the splendid vision, as we work, cheer us and lead us forward?

III.

We must carry our thoughts of the body and the members yet farther. Man, we believe, was broken into men that in every variety of relation he might work out his separate powers before all were summed up in the Christ. As the nation is a whole made up of classes, so the race is a whole made up of nations. This conception is at last coming into prominence in the fullness of time. The unity of the race offers the same problems, the same difficulties, the same hopes as the unity of the nation, though on a vaster scale. We can see that the several nations, in virtue of their character, their circumstances, their history, contribute towards the completeness of humanity. The glory of a nation, like the glory of a citizen or of a class, lies not in supremacy but in service. A nation is great when it fulfills its office, and enables other nations to fulfill theirs. There is need of the same self-repressive, and yet self-ennobling, devotion among peoples as among men for their highest development. Here also there are those who seem unable to aspire towards a worthy ideal of human life: those whose energies appear to be exhausted in self-aggrandisement. But wherever we look the promise rises before us: *I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me.*

We must then as Christians, as believers in this great unity of life, strive that other nations, no less than our own, may be enabled to

gain their full development and co-operate with us for the widest good. As Churchmen we pray for this blessing in the Litany in comprehensive words, which bring out each aspect of its fulfillment, when we beseech the Lord that He will be pleased "to give to all nations unity, peace, and concord," unity, that they may severally command for use without internal distraction all the forces entrusted to their care; peace, that they may be free from the disasters of foreign conflict; concord, that they may combine together in generous endeavors to extend the general well-being of men. The petition in its completeness is, as far as I know, unique; and it is illustrated by a question in the service for the Consecration of Bishops. For while the Candidate for the Priesthood is asked whether he will "maintain and set forward . . . quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people," he who is to be consecrated Bishop, seeing that in virtue of his office he must take a wider view of things and bear a heavier responsibility, is required to "maintain and set forward . . . quietness, love, and peace among all men."

In obedience to this charge I ask you now therefore to consider the question of international peace which, if in its accomplishment it concerns a distant future, is a searching test of the scope and vitality of our own faith. If we believe the Gospel to be what it claims to be, the fellowship of nations is included in its promised victories. The final issue may be remote, but the belief that universal peace lies in the counsel of God for mankind will influence our present conduct. In this respect the language of the prophets and of the Apocalypse expresses the truth which is involved in the Incarnation. And now at length we can see, in a long retrospect, that in spite of checks and delays the whole movement of life is towards a federation of civilized nations, preparatory to the civilization and federation of all.

Such a consummation, however visionary it may seem to be, corresponds, I say, with the course of the development both of human association and of moral ideas which we can trace in the past. As we look back, we cannot fail to notice that the social instinct which belongs to man as man has found satisfaction from time to time in widening circles, in the family, the tribe, the nation. The largest sphere of fellowship still remains to be occupied, the race. And when at last the different elements of society were harmoniously combined in the city, as it was organized in the West by the power of one life, there was a foreshadowing of this crowning fellowship of nations.

In the last century two continental revolutions have marked stages in the progess towards this largest communion of men. In the revolution of 1789 individualism found its final expression. The inheritance from the past was lightly swept aside. Men were regarded as equal units, and a vage cosmopolitanism was taken to represent the feeling of the brotherhood of mankind. In such

impoverishment of our powers and our endowments there could be no satisfaction; and in 1848 there was the beginning of a prolonged effort to secure for each people the possession of its full treasure with a view to rendering its full service. The movement was essentially a movement of nationalities, and modern Europe is the result.

Now we are reaching out to yet another change, through which the nations of Western Europe will, as I believe, be united in a close confederation, and combine to bring all the resources which they have gathered through their history to the service of the race. We understand and acknowledge as never before that nations no less than men and classes, in spite of all the disturbances of selfish ambition, must suffer together and rejoice together: that each nation has its unique endowment and establishes its greatness by the fulfillment of its mission: that each is debtor to all, alike by what it has received and by what it owes: that the end for which we look will then be reached when *the kings of the earth*, with a common devotion, *bring their glory into the city of God*.

I know the difficulties which stand in the way of such a confederation, the temptations of pride and rivalry which distract popular feeling, the inheritence of past errors and crimes which perplexes the policy of statesmen. But if Christendom is filled with one desire, I cannot but believe that God will fulfill the purpose which He inspires. The object of sincere aspiration in one generation becomes the sure possession of the next. If the thought of international concord is welcomed, the most powerful nations will recognize, as calm students recognize, that there is true strength and glory in generosity; and then, when they have put aside traditional jealousies through the stronger sense of a common duty, we shall see them islanded by neutral zones in untroubled security.

For Englishmen there is an object which is still nearer. Recent experience seems to show that a general Arbitration treaty with America is within a measurable distance. There are hopes, like prophecies, which fulfill themselves. Such a hope as this we are bound as Christians to cherish. We can all at least take care, that within the range of our influence no idle or hasty or petulant word, no ungenerous judgment shall mar it. The stable friendship of the English-speaking peoples would go far to assure the peace of the world.

The development of moral ideas, as I have said already, encourages us, no less than the progress of society, to look for the extinction of war. Little by little men have extended ever farther the claims of just consideration. A stranger is no longer an enemy. We have ceased to wish that other peoples should be like ourselves, and we honor their differences. Wars of conquest are universally condemned. The decalogue is held to have a national application. As men have been gathered in wider fellowship, sympathy has grown to match.

But it is said that the discipline which comes through military service, and the sacrifices which are required for a campaign, bring vigor to nations not unworthy of the price; and that the sufferings of war are preferable to the torpor of cowardly and selfish indulgence. But torpor is not peace. Peace calls for sacrifices as great as war, and offers fields for equal heroism. Peace demands courage of body and soul for the accomplishment of its works and kindles enthusiasm by the prospect of new victories. Perhaps our social evils are still unvanquished because we have not yet approached them with forces marshalled on a comprehensive plan, and stirred by the adour of a common service. The very fact that the fulfillment of Christian duty is described under martial images helps us to feel that the conflict with evil offers scope for every virtue which ennobles war. A patient analysis of the qualities which win our admiration in the soldier proves that the horrors of active service are not required for their development. A great modern writer has taken the problem in an extreme form, and shown that all that permanently attracts us in a character like Wallenstein is essentially Christian.

It is said again that, if we substitute arbitration for war, arbitration may miscarry. It is enough to reply that we have no security that an appeal to arms will establish a just claim. There is indeed no more reason to suppose that right as right will triumph in war than in a wager of battle. Moreover in a national controversy the question of right is rarely of easy decision. It is certainly not likely to be decided justly by "the crude, cold, cruel arbitrament" of war. And when once the contest is begun, our own experience will tell us that we think more of the establishment of our own will, than of the determination of the merits of the controversy. We pray for victory and not for the victory of righteousness. We resolve, it may be, to be generous if we succeed, but we must first establish our superiority by success. Generosity in such a temper is a tribute to self-assertion and not to justice. If justice is indeed the supreme aim of those who engage in a national dispute, the most imperfect tribunal, which has to give its decision in the face of the world after open discussion, is more likely to secure it than contending armies. Meanwhile public opinion grows more and more powerful; and, when there is time for reflection, it is substantially fair. Time brings redress for wrong; and, if we look a little forward, we shall be able to discern that a nation which has submitted to what it holds to be an unjust judgment, will find ample compensation in the increase of moral strength. Even our own recent history teaches us that there are losses which after a time come to be regarded with greater satisfaction than successes which simply witness to strength.

If then a policy of peace clearly answers to the teaching of the Gospel: if it is presented to us as preparing the last stage in the progress of human fellowship: if it is, even at the present time, more

likely to establish justice than war; what can we do to advance it?

We can avoid and discourage all language in regard to other nations which is any way inconsistent with the respect due to their position.

We can endeavor to understand their feelings, difficulties, temptations, and not to measure them even unconsciously by the standard established for us by our traditions and beliefs.

We can adopt as a rule for our own temper the memorable clause in Penn's Treaty with the Indians which bound the contracting parties "not to believe evil reports of one another."

We can labor with patient and resolute effort to gain judicial impartiality if we are required to act as judges in our own cause where arbitration is inadmissible.

We can keep our eyes steadily fixed upon the goal of our Faith, and move towards it, in quietness and confidence, whenever the way is open.

We can do all this while we show that we are resolved to guard to the uttermost the heritage which we have received in trust for the race.

The enforcement of such duties becomes more important as popular power increases; and at the same time the increase of popular power brings fresh hope. Nations are not only generous, but also, as I have said before, in great crises they respond to the claims of justice if the facts are set out clearly. I can never forget the attitude of the masses of Englishmen during the suspense in the affair of the "Trent," and when it was decided. Every one then must have thanked God that He had still kept the heart of the people whole in simple devotion to right. So it is that many popular leaders now, who do not avowedly hold the Christian Faith, have stood out boldly as champions of international peace. Their zeal may well awaken us to a sense of our duty and our power, our duty when we recall the words which, as we believe, heralded the Nativity: our power when we reflect on the Divine destiny of man. For nothing less than the conviction that *the Word became flesh* can sustain us in efforts which assume an essential equality in all who share our nature. No arguments based on material well-being are adequate to bear the strain of sacrifice. But the Gospel is. We can appeal to a Fact which gives present and permanent validity to universal instincts. If we do not appeal to it: if we do not trust it: so far we disparage it. If on the other hand we do, even with faltering, self-accusing lips, confess it, and strive through all failures to make it the rule of our conduct and our aspirations, God Himself will use our weakness for the accomplishment of His will.

The position of England among the nations imposes upon us a peculiar responsibility in regard to the problem of peace. Our national freedom, gained through an uninterrupted period of self-development, demands some corresponding service. Our immunity from the local rivalries and temptations which trouble continental

powers enables us to judge fairly, and (is it too much to hope?) to plead effectually.

The greatness of a nation is measured, I have said, not by its material triumphs but by the fulfillment of its office for humanity. The office of England is, if I interpret our history rightly, the harmonizing of classes and of peoples. The result will be secured slowly. If we have the promise that we shall win our own souls by patience, there can be no other way for winning the souls of others. We know our aim and, keeping our eyes fixed upon it, we can work and wait for the abolition of war, as earlier generations worked and waited for the abolition of slavery.

The end must come by the gift of God, and therefore I will conclude what I have to say on this subject with one practical suggestion. I think we shall do well, if on some stated day—may I name the Sunday before Christmas?—we combine to turn the thoughts of our people to this largest earthly hope of peace and good-will, and lead them to offer to Him with one heart and soul and voice the familiar supplication that "He will be pleased to give to all nations unity, peace and concord," even as on that day we pray "that He will come among us and with great might succor us," "sore let and hindered" as we are "in running the race that is set before us." The prayer will bring us near to those for whom we pray, near in spiritual fellowship.

The brotherhood of men, of classes, of nations: humanity fitly framed together by the ministry of every part for the realization and enjoyment of one harmonious life: the prevailing power of devotion to a common cause: do the phrases seem visionary and unpractical? Does then, I ask the phrase *the Word became flesh* mean less? Is that unpractical? If I am a Christian, I must hold that God wills for men the highest which we can imagine. If I am a Christian, I must for my own part acknowledge the widest issues of the Incarnation and strive to establish them. I shall not be in haste or impatient; but I shall watch the general direction of the movement of life and find in that the guidance which I need in my own labors.

At present we are beginning to recognize the influence of great ideals. They are in a true sense prophecies. Even if concrete changes are made in fact under the pressure of local and special circumstances, they are then most truly beneficent and lasting when they are made in relation to a recognized ideal. And the Christian ideal is unique in scope and power. It provides for developing and harmonizing all the elements of life, and all life. It offers to us the highest which we can conceive for man in his whole nature, and for man in the widest range. It corresponds with our loftiest hopes; and while there is no anticipation of the central Fact in which it is summed up, men have shown in fragments through the teaching of præ-Christian religions for what they were born. Are we then to suppose that the Christian ideal is unpractical? Are

we to believe that these earlier indications of natural desires are not witnessings to the will of God, of which social evolution is the imperfect and slow expression! The thought of Providence alone makes the thought of progress intelligible.

It will be urged that men are swayed by motives which are measurable: that the conclusions which are deduced from the spirit of selfishness and competition have universal validity, as long as human nature remains the same. But are we to count only on the average motives and forces which we observe at present? The revolutions of history disprove such a conclusion. It is an exceptional thing that money — material wealth — should have the value which it has now. This value is due to the dominancy of luxury, and will sink as material indulgence loses its power. Other motives may again prevail among men to guide the use of inherited possessions and the creation of new riches. This man may set himself to study — no simple problem — how he can best make his means serve the commonwealth. That man (to take actual examples) may choose to receive less than "market value" for the superintendence of a great business. Another may decline, for a time or permanently, to receive interest for the capital which he advances. And all these, if they are able to describe their experience, will probably move others to follow their examples. If great wealth is used not simply in almsgiving but in the spirit of sonship and brotherhood through the thoughtful ministry of love, it will be used more effectually than in any other way for the amelioration of industrial life in both extremes of need and superfluity.

Religious movements have in all ages brought into play exceptional forces. The social movement which is stirred about us is essentially religious. For us it is avowedly religious, religious in its inspiration, in its strength, in its end. We also live in an age of revelation. There is still spiritual power available for us if we "believe in the Holy Ghost." We have still "the prophetic word," not an antique record hard of interpretation but a living voice speaking in the events of life, *till the day dawn and the daystar arise in our hearts*. The clergy are still a truly representative body, in touch with every class; moved by the largest variety of interests and opinions which are harmonized by one devotion; trained in full fellowship with the foremost workers in the state and above the divisions of party.

It is our part then to show that the Church — the National Church — has a message to the Nation; that we bring with fresh conviction the fact of the Incarnation, unlimited in its application, to bear upon the problems of the time: that we believe in the victorious advance of the Christian Society (Matt. xvi. 18): that we have learnt in the family, and make it our business to proclaim the lesson, that social conduct is not ruled by the letter of the law, or by the decisions of "justice" or by the dictates of "self-interest": that the human, as

distinct from the personal, element must enter into the dealings of man with man: that love must interpret and supplement the verdict of exact judgement.

Men cannot, even with a show of reason, press their "rights" to the uttermost. They ask for forgiveness as they have forgiven—forgiven that is real wrong—forgone just claims. We have indeed "no rights but duties"; and these can never be discharged in full. In strictness of account we must remain debtors to the end; and through the obligations of our Faith we are debtors to all who need us.

The social changes then for which we look must be reached not by premature legislation (that is finally by force) in advance of public opinion, but through common feeling. This feeling it is our office to quicken by the exhibition of the Faith. Conduct depends upon what we believe, not indeed upon intellectual formulas, but upon our living views of man, the world, and God. In this respect the Church moulds opinion. It has by Divine appointment, as I have already said, the power "to bind and to loose," to pronounce that this is of obligation and that not: to lay down the great lines of moral duty, not negatively only but positively, in accordance with the movement of life. This she does even unconsciously. And all can assist in deepening and extending the influence by pressing quietly and persistently the duty of looking to the Faith, its motives, its restraints, its supports, in everyday conduct. Public opinion, the popular idea of right, represents the minimum (so to speak) of Christian opinion. It registers the progress of personal conviction. It finally prevails in shaping government and industry and conduct. It finds expression in effectual legislation within the sphere of law; and outside the sphere of law it exercises a controlling force, so that things (for example) which were common a hundred or fifty years ago are now practically impossible, and corresponding changes are still silently in progress.

In order to extend the range of these effective judgments, we shall strive to concentrate and give consistency to the generous aspirations which rise on many sides towards righteousness and purity and temperance and fellowship. We shall reflect what we can ourselves do to show our sincerity in advocating reforms which we believe to be needful. Some of us may be able to study special questions: we shall at least spare no pains to provide that they may be studied in order that we may apply to them wisely the teachings of Christ.

And I lay great stress on the need of patient study. Our chief danger at present is from the haste of impetuous generosity. We require not only right desires but wise counsels: careful investigation, and then resolute effort. Partial and premature remedies for evils are directly mischievous and bring discouragement afterwards. We must regard each question from many sides and then at last speak what we know. Above all we must confess unwaveringly, as I

have said, that the solution of our problems is to be religious. We shall welcome co-operation in our endeavors after the practical embodiment of Christian principles from whatever quarter it is given, but we shall not at any cost dissemble our own conviction that our Faith is our inspiration. The results at which we aim finally are spiritual, and these can only be reached, as we hold, by spiritual forces.

There is, I believe, good hope of a wide response to an appeal for social service. The course of the last century and of the last generation is rich in promise. Simple life is greater that we know, with "joy in widest commonalty spread." Even in things of sense it is only within a narrow range that "companionship is one with loss." Men are beginning to understand that "everything that is supremely precious is common," that labor is the bringer of all dignity and love the healer of all sorrow. "The main conditions of human happiness," writes one whose knowledge of the poor is intimate and wide, "I believe to be work and affection, and he who works for those he loves fulfills these conditions most easily." Nor would the quickening of interest in our own home problems lessen the interest of Christians in the distant work required of them in heathen countries. The more vivid and practical apprehension of the constraining power of the love of Christ in one field must of necessity increase the sense of obligation in every direction.

For the impluse, the encouragement, the strength, which our Faith offers to us, so far as they are felt, are felt to be unlimited in their application. God, we believe, has taken humanity to Himself, and man redeemed in Christ is called to work out his destiny in reliance on the Holy Spirit. In this Gospel lies the assurance, under the circumstances of human life, that that for which we long is within our reach. We do not make the ideal: we recognize it; and in striving for its establishment we are fellow-workers with God. In such labors the thought of the Communion of Saints comforts doubting hearts. This brings home to us naturally our Communion with God. It may well be that we shrink from the responsibility of influence while we cling to our private judgments: that we are disheartened by our failures and divisions: and then, when we ponder the Incarnation not only in its essence but in its circumstances, we come to realize that the Incarnation of the Son of God adds to authority the grace of sacrifice, to obedience the joy of Divine Fellowship, to the energy of service the endurance of love, while it offers the sense of the presence of God, as the present pledge of unity.

It may be said that these are vague words. Even so they are not vain. This is not the place for discussing details of work. Details must be dealt with in close and familiar debate. But if the Gospel in its widest range is once acknowledged, the application will follow. It will become the inspiration of personal zeal which cannot

want an object. It will encourage each worker to show his love to his friend by claiming from him the active devotion in which he finds his own joy. And it is to indefinitely increased personal devotion, to individual ministries of love and faith, to watchful efforts of wise sympathy, we must look for the fulfillment of the work of the Spirit through the Christian Society. Every believer has his own function in the Body of Christ, and in virtue of that he is an Evangelist. The office and the shop and the factory and the ship-yard and the pit, the municipal council-chamber and the board-room of "the union," are meeting-places with God where He can be honored, if those whose duty lies there enter them as having welcomed the message of the Incarnation.

For if the message of the Incarnation necessarily transcends our thoughts in its fullness, none the less it comes within the range of our experience as far as our thoughts can reach. It touches life at every point, and we are bound to consider what it means for us, for our fellow-men and for the world. It is not enough to hold it as an article of our Creed: we must openly and in secret prove its efficacy in action. By our reticence, by our habitual reserve in dealing with it as the master-power in shaping and sustaining our thoughts, our purposes, our deeds, we encourage a feeling of secret mistrust as to the validity of the Faith.

In order then that we may master our message so as to deliver it with the persuasiveness of undoubting confidence, we have need of leisure, of quiet, of reflection. The strain of life is painfully intense in every direction. Impatience and excitement bring at last the languor of indifference. The restless engagements of external religion threaten to usurp the place of spiritual worship, and traditions of living faith. Multiplied and stately services may crowd out the exercises of calm and thoughtful devotion. The outward manifestations of spiritual life may exhaust its force. In this respect the pathetic warnings of Jeremiah speak to the heart of our nation and of our Church. God grant that we may heed them while there is yet time for both to fulfill their office.

History repeats itself in its warnings and opportunities and hopes. The great hope of the first age, which burns through the New Testament, has been deferred, because the love of the first age grew cold and its faith grew feeble. Perhaps we can see that the delay was necessary because the discipline of men was not complete. In eighteen centuries we have learnt much, and the Divine promise remains unchanged and unchangeable in the Incarnation. In spite of innumerable failures the Incarnation has established on a sure foundation the trust of natural optimism. In this confidence we labor on, knowing that *He Who began will perfect.*

During the last two years I have had occasion twice to study afresh the work and the spirit of each of the greatest spiritual leaders of our Northern Church, Columba, Aidan, Hilda. And it has been

an encouragement to me to notice how each under different circumstances commends as the last lesson of varied experience peace and fellowship.

"These, my little children," said Columba, "are my last words. I charge you to keep unfeigned love one with another. If you do so after the pattern of the fathers, God, the champion of the good, will help you . . ." Having said this he passed away the same night, while he made silently the sign of blessing.

Of Aidan we know that he was chosen for the Northumbrian Mission because he showed by unpremeditated words that he was endowed with "the grace of discretion, which is the mother of virtues": a man, as Bede writes, "with a passion for peace and charity, and true priestly authority to reprove the proud and powerful, to comfort the weak and cheer the poor and uphold clemency."

When Hilda, after bearing, it is said, with thanksgiving the discipline of severe sickness, found that her end was come, she summoned her nuns and charged them to keep "the peace of the Gospel" one with another and with all men, and so "passed from death to life."

Thus our ancestors tell us with one voice that the brotherhood for which we look, the brotherhood of men, of classes, of nations, will come through spiritual fellowship. When we ponder their words, can we not feel that even now the Communion of Saints — the truth of which this glorious Chapel is a witness and a herald — is a reality? We cannot as Christians, accept the phrase "the struggle for life" as describing the true view of existence for men who are made to gain the likeness of God. In proportion as we become fit to enjoy, earth is found to be fuller of treasures, and the treasures of earth are seen to be capable of a wider distribution. In proportion as we understand the Gospel better — the Gospel which we are commissioned to proclaim in the language of our own generation — we shall see righteousness, joy, peace as the basis and the fruit of the Christian Society (Rom. xiv. 17) in place of self-assertion, excitement, competition

The time is short: the issue is momentous: the hope is great: the promise of God cannot fail. We know that the Son of God hath come: we look for His coming (1 John iv. 2 f.; 2 John 7.)

My last word must be the first word which I spoke when I came among you, of which I have known the power: *Brethern, pray for us.*

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

PRESIDENT.

The Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S. T. D.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

The Rt. Rev. Wm. Lawrence, D. D.
The Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, D. D.
The Rev. Robert A. Holland, S. T. D.
The Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D. D.
Prof. Richard T. Ely, Ph. D.
Mr. George E. McNeil.

SECRETARY.

The Rev. George Hodges, D. D.,
Diocesan House, Boston, Mass.

TREASURER.

Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, 40 State Street, Boston, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Rev. J. W. Suter, *Chairman.*

Prof. W. J. Ashley, M. A.
Mr. Edmund Billings.
The Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.
The Rev. C. H. Brent.
The Rev. W. L. Bull.
Mr. Francis Watts Lee.
The Rev. Prof. H. S. Nash, D. D.
The Rev. Philo W. Sprague.
The Rev. Floyd W. Tompkins, Jr.
Mr. John W. Wood.

COUNCIL.

The foregoing and
The Rt. Rev. H. M. Thompson, S.T.D.
The Rt. Rev. Davis Sessums, D. D.
The Rev. Arthur Brooks, D. D.
Prof. James H. Dillard
Miss Helena S. Dudley.
The Rev. W. B. Frisby.
The Rev. Prof. E. P. Gould, D. D.
The Rev. Percy S. Grant.
The Rev. George Hodge.
Mr. James L. Houghteling.
Mr. William P. Johnston, LL. D.
The Rev. A. R. Kieffer.
The Rev. J. S. Lindsay, D. D.
The Rev. Arthur A. Lowndes.
Mr. J. Blekker Miller.
The Rev. Henry Mottet, D. D.
The Rev. R. Heber Newton, D. D.
The Rev. E. N. Potter, D. D.
Miss Vida D. Scudder.
Mr. Archibald L. Sessions.
The Rev. H. H. Sleeper, Ph. D.
The Rev. Wm. Harman Van Allen.
The Rev. Geo. R. Van De Water, D.D.
Mr. Everett P. Wheeler.
The Rev. John Williams.
Mr. George Zabriskie.

OBJECTS.—1. To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. 2. To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time. 3. To present Christ in practical life as the living Master and King, the Enemy of wrong and selfishness, the Power of righteousness and love.

MEMBERSHIP is open to all communicants of the Episcopal Church upon application to the Secretary and the payment of one dollar per annum.

PUBLICATIONS.—A semi-monthly series of Publications is issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee, but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

SUBSCRIPTION to the Publications, one dollar per annum. Special rate to members: Annual Dues and Subscription to the Publications both at one time, strictly in advance, one dollar.

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 5. | AUGUST 1, 1895. | PER ANNUM, $1.00. SINGLE NUMBERS, 10C.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

PASSAGES FROM THE WRITINGS

OF

JOSEPH MAZZINI.

BOSTON.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

THE DIOCESAN HOUSE,

1895.

PUBLICATIONS.

The following papers have appeared, or will shortly appear, in the Publications of the Union. They may be had from the Secretary at ten cents each. Subscription, one dollar per annum.

SERIES A.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.
Rev. R. A. Holland, S.T.D.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY IN RELATION TO THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH.
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D.

THE INCARNATION A REVELATION OF HUMAN DUTIES.
Rt. Rev. B. F. Westcott, D.D.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY FATHERS. (Two views.)

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
Joseph Mazzini.

AN ADDRESS BEFORE HARVARD UNIVERSITY.
Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D.D.

SERIES B.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE OF 1894.
Prof. W. J. Ashley, M.A.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIME.
Prof. Henry C. Adams, Ph.D.

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.
Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.

THE SLUMS OF GREAT CITIES AND THEIR PROBLEMS.
Rev. P. W. Sprague.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND PRACTICAL LIFE.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

THE HOUSING OF THE WORKING PEOPLE.
Rev. P. W. Sprague.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR STUDENTS.

STRIKES.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

AN EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

AMERICAN TRADES UNIONS.

These publications are issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee; but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

NOTE.

Joseph Mazzini, saint and revolutionary, was not only one of the creators of Italian unity and independence, but also one of the greatest teachers of this century. He was born in 1805 at Genoa; for years exiled and living in France, Switzerland, and England; he founded the society of "Young Italy," in 1831, and in 1834 founded "Young Europe;" in 1849 he governed the short-lived Roman Republic, as one of three Triumvirs, "in the name of God and the People;" in 1872 he died at Pisa.

The most complete edition of his writings is published under the title "*Scritti editi e inediti di Guiseppe Mazzini*," begun by himself and continued by Satti. The most complete English edition is "Life and Writings of Joseph Mazzini." 6 vols. London, Smith, Elder & Co. A briefer "Memoir," by E. A. V. (Madame Venturi), with his essays, "Thoughts on Democracy," and The "Duties of Man," and two portraits, was published by King, London, 1875 (transferred later to Truelove, Holborn, London). Funk & Wagnalls have brought out a cheap edition of "The Duties of Man." (New York, 1892), 15 cents.

A volume of his "Essays" edited with a suggestive introduction by William Clark, has also been published by Scott (London, 1887) in the Camelot series. An edition of "Mazzini's Essays" has recently appeared, translated by Thomas Ober, and edited and an introduction written by Bolton King (London, Dent & Co., 1894).

A critical estimate of his life and teaching will be found in F. W. H. Myers' "Essays Modern," London, Macmillan & Co., 1883; and there are some remarks therein by Arnold Toynbee, in his lecture on Democracy and Natural Law. Of the passages here reprinted the first is taken from his "Thoughts upon Democracy in Europe," written in English for the "People's Journal" in 1847, and the second, from his paper "On the Duties of Man," originally written in Italian for "*Apostolato Italiano*," a journal issued by Mazzini for the Italian workingmen in England, in 1844.

W. J. A.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

PASSAGES FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOSEPH MAZZINI.

I.

The ideas which have long agitated the camp of Democracy, may, if maturely considered, be classed under two great doctrines; which, again, may be summed up in two words — *Rights and Duties*. Their varieties are numerous; the seeming varieties still more so. Schools which start from the same point and profess to have the same object, terminate, some in a new despotism, others in anarchy; some in the re-enthronement of obsolete faiths; others in vague and mystic aspirations after an indeterminate future: but all are, in one way or another, connected with the doctrine based upon the *rights* of the *human individual*, or with that which is derived from something superior to all individuals, superior to society itself. The former doctrine still rules throughout the ranks of democracy; it has hitherto reigned undisputed in England and America, uncontested save by a few eminent writers, who are little followed. The second, more recent, and numerically weak, has, nevertheless, since 1830, gained over all the purest and choicest minds of the Continent. I think it is destined to triumph, and to organize democracy under its colors, because it starts from a religious point of view inaccessible to the former. This is sufficient to explain the spirit in which these thoughts will be written. I shall need all the toleration, all the habit of free discussion which distinguishes English readers, for, in examining the school which reposes on *individual rights* I shall shock many ideas accepted by the majority of democrats. But the question is too serious for the necessity of examining it and discussing it freely under every phase, not to be allowed. . . . Democracy is, above all, an *educational problem*, and as the value of all education depends on the truth of the principle upon which it is based, the whole future of democracy is engaged in this question. . . .

The doctrine which takes individual rights for its starting-point has played, especially in the last sixty years, an important part, highly beneficial to humanity. Arising, or more correctly speaking, reduced to a formula, at a time when the religious life of nations was still in great measure subject to colleges of priests of whatsoever description, their political life to governments of whatsoever description, their intellectual life to censors, and their industrial life to revenue officers;—it has struck down, destroyed, or undermined all these. It has conquered, whether morally or actually is of little importance, for every moral conquest must sooner or later become actual—liberty of conscience, political securities, and freedom of the press; recently it has conquered free trade. Here is a great and noble part in the history of the world, which can never be denied to this doctrine. But the important question for democracy is not there. *Is that enough?* Are all these conquests the end, or are they not rather the means to enable us to attain the *end?* And if this is so, can the principle of the *Ego*, of *individual right* if laid down as the basis of our moral and political education, can it guide man, can it associate men for that end, for those ulterior conquests? That is the question. Whoever examines things at all seriously, will perceive that the doctrine of individual rights is essentially and in principle, only a great and holy protest in favor of human liberty against oppression of every kind. Its value, therefore, is purely negative. It is able to destroy; it is impotent to found. It is mighty to break chains; it has no power to knit bonds of co-operation and love.

Suppose you have before you men free, emancipated, conscious of their faculties, acquainted with their rights, with God's universe open before them. What use will they make of their liberty? In what way will they employ their faculties? Whither and how will they direct their march? Is not this question—the vital question for the human creature—still untouched? The doctrine of *rights* has given men ability to act: but what will now be their action? Is not this the problem of which we are seeking the solution? . . .

Democracy is not the mere liberty of all, but *Government freely consented to by all, and acting for all.* What the world thirsts for at present is,—whatever some may say—*authority*. All its insurrections are directed, not

against the idea of power, but against the parody of that idea. . . . We desire to be guided; only we wish the best and wisest among us to be our guides. We desire to be associated as closely as possible in a common union in pursuit of a common object; only we wish this union to be freely accepted, this object not to be a fragmentary object, the object of a single class or part. And far from delighting, as so many believe, or pretend to believe, in disorganization or anarchy, democracy—like the world, whose moving spirit it is at present—thirsts for unity; but, inspired by bitter experience, it declares that henceforth no unity is possible where an artificial inequality reigns; where a spirit of domination on the one hand, and of distrust and reaction on the other, prevent all community of ideas, and parcel out humanity into distinct classes, by giving them different interests.

The doctrine of individual rights is so incompetent to solve the question as I have here laid it down, that it is terrified at the idea of government. Its supporters regard government as a necessary inconvenience; to which they submit, on condition of giving it as little power as possible. In their theory, government, reduced nearly to the functions of a police constable, deprived of every initiative, has no mission but to *prevent*. It is there to repress crime and violence; to secure to every individual the exercise of his rights against any brutal attack of his neighbors—nothing more. And lest, seduced by the sweets of the power deposited in its hands, it should attempt to overstep these narrow bounds, they surround it with suspicion, with mistrust, with hostile local powers; they devote their whole study to organize a system of guarantees against its possible encroachments. Here is, properly speaking, no society, nothing but an aggregation of individuals, bound over to keep the peace, but for the rest following their own individual objects; *Laissez faire, laissez passer*, is the formula of the school.

This is not the ideal we seek; no, certainly, it was not to obtain the ignoble and immoral *every one for himself*, that so many great men, holy martyrs of thought, have shed, from epoch to epoch, from century to century, the tears of the soul, the sweat and blood of the body. Beings of devotedness and love, they labored and suffered for something higher than the individual; for that Humanity which ought to be the object of all our efforts, and to

which we are all responsible. Before a generation which scorned or persecuted them, they calmly uttered their prophetic thoughts; with an eye fixed on the horizon of future times, speaking to that *collective* being which ever lives, which ever learns, and in which the divine idea is progressively realized; for that city of the human race,* which alone, by the association of all intellects, of all loves, and of all forces, can accomplish the providential design that presided over our creation here below. We are all responsible to and for one another. We all live for others; the individual for his family, the family for its country, the country for humanity. We all seek the Law of our life; and with us (as in all that exists), the law of the individual is discovered only in the law of the species. We are all climbing a pyramid, whose base embraces the earth, and whose point rises towards God: the ascent is slow and painful, and we can accomplish it only by joining all our hands, by aiding ourselves with our united strength, by closing up our ranks, like the Macedonian phalanx, when any of us fall exhausted by fatigue. Herein, in this necessity, lies the legitimacy of democracy, of its aspirations after the emancipation, the elevation, the co-operation of all: herein, also, lies the secret of its inevitable power—inevitable as the accomplishment of the designs of God.

But if from these heights, where all human desires become purified; where the efforts by which we strive to transform the medium in which we live, receive a religious consecration—you bring democracy down to the narrow arena of individual tendencies; giving it mere individual rights for weapons, and a mere theory of liberty for its aim, without a higher common rule of action; you change its all-embracing, all-sanctifying nature into a something reactionary and hostile; you destroy its organic thought, its eminently social instincts, its thirst for general education, for belief and for unity of direction, to substitute for these a nameless species of peaceful anarchy, in which man will begin by the worship of individuality, and will fall by degrees into the abysses of egotism. And in the mean time you excite, and in some measure justify, the terrors and repugnance of the society you are desirous to gain over; you unconsciously sow hatred; you alienate from

* "Civitas generis humani;" the expression of all great men from Tacitus to Dante (De Monarchia) from Dante to Bacon.

us many superior minds,* who think democracy barren, godless, and consequently impotent.

I am aware that many who adopt the doctrine I am refuting will be astonished at the consequences I deduce from it. They dream of the future much as I do; they examine their own hearts, and find that they are ready to devote themselves for others; for the future prospects of humanity; for the development of social instincts; for all that I declare to be the final aim of democracy. These men are better than their doctrine: their heart is better than their head; it *feels* the *collective* life of humanity—it communes with it; that feeling hurries them into a practice which contradicts their theory. But what assurance have they that others will do what they do? We have to do here, not with the actions of individuals, we have to test the value of a *principle* to be our guide in general education; we have to do with the influence which that principle may exercise on men already more or less corrupted by an education received under the state of things we desire to abolish, or by a total absence of education.

You speak, some will say to me, of unity of belief, and consequently of education; you condemn our distrust, our system of guarantees; our theory of liberty. Would you entrust to societies founded on privilege, the initiative of future progress? And ought we, for fear of anarchy, to incur the risk of despotism?

God forbid! The struggle for liberty is as sacred as human individuality; maintain it to the last. Wherever Government—corrupt or behind the age—has no true educational mission, beware of giving it one: surround yourselves with guarantees, so long as you can do no better. Only do not elevate into a final theory that which is but a sad temporary necessity; do not limit the problem to a mere overthrowing of obstacles. We are clearing the ground in order to raise a new edifice. We need liberty, as much to fulfill a *duty* as to exercise a *right;* we must retain it. But if you give to your political education a higher religious principle, liberty will become what it ought really to be—the ability to choose between various *means* of doing good; if you enthrone it alone, as at once means

---

* e. g. Thomas Carlyle, a democrat by every instinctive tendency, denies democracy a future, because he confounds it with the school I am combating.

and *end*, it will . . . lead society first to anarchy, afterwards to the despotism which you fear.

Suppose the rights of one individual temporarily opposed to those of another, how will you reconcile them, except by appealing to something superior to all rights? Given the right to increase their wealth, recognized in all, how will you solve, without appealing to another principle, the great and persistent question between the workman and the manufacturer, his employer? Suppose an individual revolting against the bonds of society; he feels himself strong, his inclinations, his faculties, call him to a path other than the common; he has a right to develop them, and he wages war against the community. Consider well, what argument can you oppose to him consistently with the doctrine of rights? What right have you, from the mere fact that you are a majority, to impose upon him obedience to laws which are not in harmony with *his* individual rights and aspirations? Rights are equal for all; society cannot have one more than an individual. How then will you prove to that man that he ought to confound his own will with the will of his brethren? By imprisonment? By the scaffold? That is to say, wherever society has not given education, *by violence.* Suppose one of those solemn crises which threaten the life of a country, and call for the active devotedness of all its sons—a foreign invasion, a violent attempt to substitute a tyranny for the fundamental laws of the state—some great and indispensable progress to be won for a suffering class, is it in the name of rights that you will call on the citizen to dare martyrdom? Is not the first of rights the right to life? You have taught him that society was constituted for the sole purpose of securing to him *his rights;* and now you demand of him to sacrifice them all—to suffer, to die for the safety of his country—for the progress of a class which perhaps is not even his own! No; he will calculate the risks and the chances of success, and act accordingly; or he will declare himself a cosmopolite — will say — as, in fact, has been often said — "*Ube bene, iba patria*" — [Where I am well off, there is my country]: he will carry his at his shoe-sole, and you will have no right to address to him a single reproach. The man has only been logical consistent with the principle of the education you have given him. . . .

And tell me, when you look at the nations which enjoy more or less liberty—tell me, O my friends in the struggle—whence comes this incessant, ever-growing complaint of the *people*, of the laborious classes, of the millions who toil and suffer. Is there not here an energetic protest against the impotence of that incomplete doctrine which makes the *individual* at once means and end?

II.

The theory of Rights may suffice to arouse men to overthrow the obstacles placed in their path by tyranny, but it is impotent where the object in view is to create a noble and powerful harmony between the various elements of which the nation is composed. With the theory of happiness as the primary aim of existence we shall only produce egotists who will carry the old passions and desires into the new order of things, and introduce corruption into it a few months after. We have therefore to seek a Principle of Education superior to any such theory, and capable of guiding mankind onwards towards their own improvement, of teaching them constancy and self-sacrifice, and of uniting them with their fellow-men, without making them dependent either on the *idea* of a single man or the *force* of the majority.

This principle is DUTY. We must convince men that they are all sons of one sole God, and bound to fulfil and execute one sole law here on earth: that each of them is bound to live, not for himself, but for others; that the aim of existence is, not to be more or less happy, but to make themselves and others more virtuous; that to struggle against injustice and error (wherever they exist), in the name and for the benefit of their brothers, is not only a *right* but a Duty; a duty which may not be neglected without sin; the duty of their whole life.

Working-men, brothers! understand me well! When I say that the consciousness of your rights will never suffice to produce an important and durable progress, I do not ask you to renounce those rights. I merely say that such rights can only exist as a consequence of duties fulfilled, and that we must begin with fulfilling the last in order to achieve the first. And when I say that in proposing happiness, well-being, or material interests, as the aim of existence, we run the risk of producing egotists, I do not say

that you ought never to occupy yourselves with these; but I do say that the exclusive endeavor after material interests, sought for, not as a *means*, but as an *end*, always leads to disastrous and deplorable results. . . .

Material ameliorations are essential, and we will strive to obtain them, not because the one thing necessary to man is that he should be well housed and nourished; but because you can neither acquire a true consciousness of your own dignity, nor achieve your own moral development, so long as you are engaged, as at the present day, in a continual struggle with poverty and want. . . .

When you hear those who preach the necessity of a social transformation declare that they can accomplish it solely by invoking your rights, be grateful to them for their good intentions, but be distrustful of their success. The sufferings of the poor are partially known to the wealthier classes; *known*, but not *felt*. In the general indifference resulting from the absence of a common faith; in the egotism which is the inevitable consequence of so many years spent in preaching material happiness; those who do not suffer themselves have, little by little, become accustomed to regard the sufferings of others as a sorrowful necessity of social organization, or to leave the remedy to the generations to come. The difficulty lies, not so much in convincing them, as in rousing them from their inertia, and inducing them, when once convinced, to *act*; to associate together, and to fraternize with you in order to create such a social organization as shall put an end—as far as human possibilities allow—to your sufferings and their own fears.

Now, to do this is a work of Faith; of faith in that mission which God has given to his human creature here on earth; in the responsibility which weighs upon all those who fail to fulfil that mission; and in the Duty imposed upon all, of continual endeavor and sacrifice in the cause of truth.

Any conceivable doctrine of Right and material happiness can only lead you to attempts which, so long as you remain isolated, and rely solely on your own strength, can never succeed; and which can but result in that worst of crimes, a civil war between class and class.

Working-men! Brothers! When Christ came, and changed the face of the world, he spoke not of rights to the rich, who needed not to achieve them; nor to the poor,

who would doubtless have abused them, in imitation of the rich; he spoke not of utility nor of interest to a people whom interest and utility had corrupted; he spoke of Duty, he spoke of Love, of Sacrifice, and of Faith; and he said that "*they should be first among all who had contributed most by their labor to the good of all.*"

And the words of Christ, breathed in the ear of a society in which all true life was extinct, recalled it to existence, conquered the millions, conquered the world, and caused the education of the human race to ascend one degree on the scale of progress.

Working-men! We live in an epoch similar to that of Christ. We live in the midst of a corrupt society, feeling in our inmost soul the need of reanimating and transforming it, and of uniting all its various members in one sole faith, beneath one sole law, in one sole Aim—the free and progressive development of all the faculties of which God has given the germ to his creatures. We seek the kingdom of God *on earth as it is in heaven*, or rather, that earth may become a preparation for heaven, and society an endeavor after the progressive realization of the Divine Idea.

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

PRESIDENT.

The Rt. Rev. F. D. HUNTINGTON, S. T. D.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

The Rt. Rev. WM. LAWRENCE, D. D.
The Rt. Rev. HENRY C. POTTER, D. D.
The Rev. ROBERT A. HOLLAND, S. T. D.
The Rev. W. S. RAINSFORD, D. D.
Prof. RICHARD T. ELY, Ph. D.
Mr. GEORGE E. MCNEIL.

SECRETARY.

The Rev. GEORGE HODGES, D. D.,
Diocesan House, Boston, Mass.

TREASURER.

Mr. ROBERT H. GARDINER, 40 State Street, Boston, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Rev. J. W. SUTER, *Chairman.*

Prof. W. J. ASHLEY, M. A.
Mr. EDMUND BILLINGS.
The Rev. W. D. P. BLISS.
The Rev. C. H. BRENT.
The Rev. W. L. BULL.
Mr. FRANCIS WATTS LEE.
The Rev. Prof. H. S. NASH, D. D.
The Rev. PHILO W. SPRAGUE.
The Rev. FLOYD W. TOMPKINS, Jr.
Mr. JOHN W. WOOD.

COUNCIL.

The foregoing and
The Rt. Rev. H. M. THOMPSON, S.T.D.
The Rt. Rev. DAVIS SESSUMS, D. D.
The Rev. ARTHUR BROOKS, D. D.
Prof. JAMES H. DILLARD.
Miss HELENA S. DUDLEY.
The Rev. W. B. FRISBY.
The Rev. Prof. E. P. GOULD, D. D.
The Rev. PERCY S. GRANT.
The Rev. GEORGE HODGE.
Mr. JAMES L. HOUGHTELING.
Mr. WILLIAM P. JOHNSTON, LL. D.
The Rev. A. R. KIEFFER.
The Rev. J. S. LINDSAY, D. D.
The Rev. ARTHUR A. LOWNDES.
Mr. J. BLEEKER MILLER.
The Rev. HENRY MOTTET, D. D.
The Rev. R. HEBER NEWTON, D. D.
The Rev. E. N. POTTER, D. D.
Miss VIDA D. SCUDDER.
Mr. ARCHIBALD L. SESSIONS.
The Rev. H. H. SLEEPER, Ph. D.
The Rev. WM. HARMAN VAN ALLEN.
The Rev. GEO. R. VAN DE WATER, D.D.
Mr. EVERETT P. WHEELER.
The Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS.
Mr. GEORGE ZABRISKIE.

OBJECTS.—1. To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. 2. To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time. 3. To present CHRIST in practical life as the living Master and King, the Enemy of wrong and selfishness, the Power of righteousness and love.

MEMBERSHIP is open to all communicants of the Episcopal Church upon application to the Secretary and the payment of one dollar per annum.

PUBLICATIONS.—A semi-monthly series of Publications is issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee, but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

SUBSCRIPTION to the Publications, one dollar per annum. Special rate to members: Annual Dues and Subscription to the Publications both at one time, strictly in advance, one dollar.

3 363.19

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 6. | SEPTEMBER 1, 1895. | PER ANNUM, $1.00. SINGLE NUMBERS, 10C.

WHAT THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION IS

BOSTON.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

THE DIOCESAN HOUSE,

1895.

Francis Watts Lee
Oct 9 - 1895.

WHAT THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION IS.

"The time has come to vote urgency for the social question." "We are of those who are convinced that the ultimate solution of this social question is bound to be discovered in the Person and life of Jesus Christ." These two sentences, written by Canon Scott Holland, indicate the starting point of the CHURCH SOCIAL UNION. It starts with the Incarnation. It is organized now because its members believe that the thing supremely necessary to-day is to consider the social problem in the light of the Incarnation.

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION is the American daughter of the English CHRISTIAN SOCIAL UNION. The English society was organized in 1889, under the lead of such men as Professor Westcott (now Bishop of Durham), President; Canon Scott Holland, Chairman of the London Branch; the Rev. Charles Gore, M.A. (now Canon of Westminster), President of the Oxford Branch, and the Rev. John Carter of Pusey House, Oxford, Secretary. It has to-day, in England, 37 branches, with some 2400 members, and also affiliated branches in some of the English colonies.

It works by holding meetings and spreading literature for the study of social questions in the light of the Mastership of Christ. The London branch has been active in holding services and courses of sermons in various churches, and particularly in St. Edmund's, Lombard Street, and St. Mary-le-Strand, where, during Lent, business men have crowded the church on week-days; to hear the foremost preachers and thinkers of the English Church consider the practical problems of the social and industrial life in the light of Christ's life and social teachings. Two volumes of selections from these courses have been pub-

lished under the titles of "*Lombard Street in Lent*," and "*A Lent in London.*" The Oxford Branch has devoted itself to the systematic study, week by week, of current economic problems.

The important "Economic Review" is published for the Oxford Branch of the Union, while numerous tracts and smaller publications are creating a small library of earnest Christian social thought. Altogether, the influence of the Society is permeating the English Church, notably in the University centres of Oxford and Cambridge, and in busy London, as well as in the smaller parishes. The society is unquestionably one of the most important to-day in the English Church. Its declared objects are identical with those of the American society which we print below.

The American CHURCH SOCIAL UNION is of more recent date. In 1890, the Rev. R. A. Holland, S. T. D., of St. Louis, while on a visit to Oxford, became deeply interested in the work of the English Union, and returning to this country, consulted on the matter with the Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, Bishop of Central New York. A meeting was called in New York City, and an American CHRISTIAN SOCIAL UNION was organized April 3, 1891. Bishop Huntington was chosen President, and Prof. R. T. Ely, then of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, was made Secretary. The society grew rapidly, and elicited considerable interest. Some ten branches were formed. But after Prof. Ely's removal to Madison, Wis., the executive officers were so scattered that sustained energetic effort proved impossible, and the society almost lost life. November 13, 1894, however, it was reorganized in Boston; an Executive Committee was chosen, with a majority in or near that city, enabling them to meet and act together; a new Constitution was adopted, and the name changed to THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION, to indicate its appeal, not only to the Christian life, but also to the Church, in her organic capacity as the steward of the mysteries of God. Gradually the society has revived; $1000 was raised or pledged for its work; two series of short papers or studies have been begun and are appearing semi-monthly; old members have renewed their membership, and the society begins the winter of 1895 with every prospect of usefulness, of strength, and of success. The President of THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION is the Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S. T. D., Bishop of Central New York. Its Vice-Presidents are,

Bishops William Lawrence, D.D., of Massachusetts, and Henry C. Potter, D.D., of New York; Dr. R. A. Holland, of St. Louis; Dr. W. S. Rainsford, of New York City; Prof. R. T. Ely, of the University of Wisconsin; and Mr. G. E. McNeill, of Boston, one of the founders of the American Federation of Labor. Its Secretary is the Rev. George Hodges, D.D., Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.; its Treasurer, Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, of Boston, Mass.; the Chairman of the Executive Committee, the Rev. John W. Suter, of Winchester, Mass.; the Chairman of the Publication Committee, Prof. W. J. Ashley, M.A., of Harvard University.

The declared objects of the Union are the same as those of the English CHRISTIAN SOCIAL UNION, and read as follows: —

OBJECTS.

1. To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice.
2. To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time.
3. To present CHRIST in practical life as the living Master and King, the Enemy of wrong and selfishness, the Power of righteousness and love.

MEMBERSHIP.

Membership (entitling to Publications) is open to all communicants of the Episcopal Church upon application to the Secretary and the payment of one dollar.

Subscriptions to the Publications are received from non-members at one dollar per annum.

METHODS.

The methods of the Union are declared by the Constitution to be:

1. Prayer.
2. The encouragement, by precept and example, of a conscientious use of the ballot.
3. The preaching of sermons by clerical members on topics connected with the Union, especially on St. Philip and St. James Day, or the first Sunday in May, and the Sunday before the first Monday in September (the Sunday before Labor Day).

4. The appointment of suitable persons as Organizers to present the principles of the Union in churches and other public places; but especially in schools, colleges and theological seminaries, as opportunity may offer.

5. The proper use of the press and the publication and circulation of such tracts, leaflets, monographs and treatises upon subjects connected with the objects of the Union, as occasion may require.

6. The publication, as a medium of communication between the members of the Union, and as a vehicle for the purposes of Sect. 5, of a monthly organ, either in the form of an independent paper or in the form of a fixed department in some existing and suitable paper, which department shall be controlled by the General Secretary of the Union, subject to the direction of the Executive Committee, or of a Publication Committee appointed by it.

7. The recommendation of courses of reading upon subjects connected with the objects of the Union.

8. The formation of local circles or Chapters for the study of such courses of reading, the careful observation of existing conditions of social life, and such practical work as may suggest itself.

9. The encouragement of the study of Social Science by the establishment of prizes, scholarships, fellowships, lectureships and professorships, in so far as the funds shall be provided therefor.

10. The encouragement in individuals and in Chapters of efforts for the promotion of industrial peace and for the preservation of friendly relations between various social classes, or the establishment of such relations where they do not exist.

11. Conventions of the local Chapters in various districts supplemental to the Annual Meeting of the Union provided for by Art. X.

12. Such other lines of work as may be suggested and approved hereafter.

What the Union is Doing.

The Church Social Union is at present, as its chief work, issuing two series of monthly Publications which are being widely circulated and which it hopes will lead to the foundation of groups for study in parishes, colleges and divinity schools, or in connection with societies, or wherever there may be an opportunity. Series "A" of these

Publications is intended to consider primarily the fundamental principles of the Union. The numbers of this series which have thus far appeared are:

"The Church of the World." Rev. R. A. Holland, S.T.D.
"The Church's Duty in Relation to the Sacredness of Property." Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.
"Social Problems and the Church." Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D.
"The Incarnation a Revelation of Human Duties." Rt. Rev. B. F. Westcott, D.D.
"Rights and Duties." Joseph Mazzini.
"What the Church Social Union Is."
"The Social Teaching of the Early Fathers." (Two views.) By the Rev. C. L. Marson and the Rev. W. F. Cobb.

Series "B" is intended to consider the detailed application of the principles of Christianity to the concrete problems of the day. The issues of this series thus far have been:

"The Railroad Strike of 1894." Prof. W. J. Ashley, M. A.
"An Interpretation of the Social Movements of our Time." Prof. Henry C. Adams, Ph. D.
"Arbitration and Conciliation." Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.
"Political Economy and Practical Life." Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.
"A Plan of Work."

Besides the above there are in preparation:

"A Bibliography for Students." F. W. Lee.
"The Slums of Great Cities and Their Problems." Rev. P. W. Sprague.
"An Eight-Hour Day."
"American Trades Unions."
"Strikes." Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

Single copies of any of these may be had from the Secretary at 10 cents each. The subscription price is one dollar per year.

Besides the publication of these studies, the Union arranges for special public services and hopes to have these grow into courses of sermons at seasons such as Advent and Lent, to be arranged as opportunity may present in various cities and parishes. At the last Annual Meeting in Boston, May 1, 1894, the society appointed a committee to use its good offices in doing what was possible to ob-

tain the settlement by arbitration of an important strike in the vicinity. Thus quietly, and feeling its way towards larger action, THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION is working ever that it may acquire strength to exert an influence in America such as has already proved so useful and helpful in England.

Meanwhile it must not be forgotten that the main purpose of the Union is the careful study of the practical application of Christ's Gospel, feeling that out of the full knowledge of Jesus Christ shall eventually issue the better, fuller, social life.

Says Canon Scott Holland concerning the studies of the English Union: "The application of the redemptive force of Christ to actual society can be no very simple matter. The problems raised by human society are manifold, intricate and immense; and, however firm our convictions may be that Christ is Himself their one and only solution, yet the solution of a difficult problem must, of necessity, be itself difficult; and, if the perplexities have been themselves a matter of long and gradual growth, then their undoing also will be slow and gradual. Still harder is it to define the degree of approach to the Christian ideal of society which the situation of our civilization at any particular moment permits. The application of Christ's victory to society must perforce take into consideration the degree to which the materials are in a condition to surrender themselves to His dominion or to admit of becoming His instruments. Slowly and gradually they must be brought over to the uses of the Kingdom; but, how slowly? and how gradually? and can the pace be quickened by a little courage? and are we lagging far behind even the possibilities already touched? These are the questions; and they can only be answered by those who have got long past the merely sentimental assertion that Christ is all in all; and have set themselves to the solid task of discovering what that solemn truth really and precisely means, and have worked it down into the concrete facts, and have surveyed and estimated the full need of the circumstances, and striven to make clear to themselves what is the first step, and what the second and the third, if that great royalty of Christ is, in very deed, ever to be made good here on earth, amid men as they are, and after a history such as they have had. We cannot all of us undertake such a study as this involves; we have

not the leisure nor the brains. But that is just why we should all take some direct measures for keeping in touch with those who have the faculties and the opportunities that we lack. Some servants of the Church there *must* be, who will give themselves seriously to the training that such a task involves; and, then, the knowledge and the experience amassed by these few, must be absorbed and utilized by the many. This can be done if a sufficient body of Christian men will take the trouble to put themselves in sympathetic contact with those who know, and so to keep themselves alive and alert, in order that they may keenly and vividly appreciate the stress of the actual pressure which is inflicted by the present situation, and may be quick to understand the wrong, and eager to look for the means of its undoing, and ready to examine the means proposed, in the steady conviction that all wrongs *can* be undone in the Name and Power of Christ. * * * * The aim is distinct and definite enough. The cause is urgent. It is for us to give it our patience, our courage and our prayers."

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 7. | OCT. 1, 1895. | PER ANNUM, $1.00. SINGLE NUMBERS, 10c.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

TWO VIEWS

BY THE

REV. C. L. MARSON AND THE REV. W. F. COBB.

BOSTON:
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
THE DIOCESAN HOUSE,
1 JOY STREET.
1895.

Francis W. Lee

Nov. 7, 1895.

PUBLICATIONS.

The following papers have appeared, or will shortly appear, in the Publications of the Union. They may be had from the Secretary at ten cents each. Subscription, one dollar per annum.

SERIES A.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.
Rev. R. A. Holland, S.T.D.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY IN RELATION TO THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH.
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D.

THE INCARNATION A REVELATION OF HUMAN DUTIES.
Rt. Rev. B. F. Westcott, D.D.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
Joseph Mazzini.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY FATHERS. (Two views.)
Revs. C. L. Marson and W. F. Cobb.

WHAT THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION IS.

AN ADDRESS BEFORE HARVARD UNIVERSITY.
Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D.D.

SERIES B.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE OF 1894.
Prof. W. J. Ashley, M.A.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIME.
Prof. Henry C. Adams, Ph.D.

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.
Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND PRACTICAL LIFE.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

THE SLUMS OF GREAT CITIES AND THEIR PROBLEMS.
Rev. P. W. Sprague.

STRIKES.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

A PLAN OF WORK.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR STUDENTS.
F. W. Lee.

AN EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

AMERICAN TRADES UNIONS.

These Publications are issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee; but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY FATHERS.

By Rev. Charles L. Marson.

Those of us who owe most to the Tractarian movement cannot but regret the fact that the High Churchman of to-day is content merely to occupy ground already won. He considers himself to be the lineal descendant of the Puseyites just because he can mimic their tones and wrap himself in their old chasubles. But when it comes to extending their principles, with their old zeal, their strenuous and bold piety, their crusading spirit, it never seems to cross his mind that such new applications are possible, or if possible desirable, to any other matters than ecclesiological ones. Granted that all the Tractarians' reform began at the altar; granted that they showed that the associative principle is of the very essence of the Faith; still it does not follow that they wanted to stop those reforms at the west door or the lych-gate; still less that they wished to store the leaven of the Faith in the vessels of abstract and general statement, and never to use it. Their work was to set in order the Church; to draw attention to her misunderstood doctrines, her broken discipline, her neglected decencies, and her belittled claims. They had no time to extend the rule of the principles they fought for to the street and the shop, the market and the law-court. These and many other applications remain for us who come after; and would that we could brace ourselves to this work with anything like their reverent and manful spirit!

Yet an application of Catholic principle to political and social questions has been more than hinted at by the Tractarians themselves. Let us take one extract from the leader, who to us, in these later days, seems the pre-eminent genius of the whole movement: "Strictly speaking, the Christian Church, as being a visible society, is necessarily a political power and party. It may be a party triumphant or a party under persecution; but a party it must always be, prior in existence to the civil institutions with which it is

surrounded, and from its latent divinity formidable and influential, even to the end of time. The grant of permanency was made in the beginning, not to the mere doctrine of the Gospel, but to the Association itself, built upon the doctrine (St. Matt. xvi. 18); in prediction not only of the indestructibility of Christianity, but of the medium also through which it was to be manifested to the world. Thus the ecclesiastical body is a divinely appointed means towards realizing the great Evangelical blessings. Christians depart from their duty, or become in an offensive sense political, not when they act as members of one community, but when they do so for temporal ends or in an illegal manner; not when they assume the attitude of a party, but when they split into many. If the primitive believers did not interfere with the acts of the civil government, it was merely because they had no rights enabling them legally to do so. But where they have rights the case is different (Acts xvi. 37–39); and the existence of a secular spirit is to be ascertained, not by their using these, but their using them for ends short of the ends for which they were given. Doubtless, in criticising the mode of their exercising them in a particular case, differences of opinion may fairly exist; but the principle itself, the duty of using their civil rights in the service of religion, is clear; and since there is a popular misconception that Christians, and especially the clergy as such, have no concern in temporal affairs, it is expedient to take every opportunity of formally denying the position, and demanding a proof of it. In truth, the Church was framed for the express purpose of interfering, or (as irreligious men will say) meddling with the world. It is the plain duty of its members not only to associate internally, but also to develop that internal union in an external warfare with the spirit of evil, whether in kings' courts, or among the mixed multitude; and if they can do nothing else, at least they can suffer for the truth, and remind men of it, by inflicting upon them the task of persecution." *

A candid examination of the writings of the "primitive believers" must lead us to see that if they had possessed rights enabling them to "interfere with the acts of the civil

* Newman's "History of the Arians," pt. ii. ch. iii. p. 264.

government," they would have used these on behalf of the frankest Socialism, and that in exact proportion to their own orthodoxy.*

Where the Catholic Faith is merely latent, there the Socialism is also less explicit. When the writer is unsound in his orthodoxy, then he is almost sure to favor some form of individualist law or possession. When the writer is sound and saintly, then he is always entirely and unhesitatingly in favor of the common holding of goods, of equality of opportunity, of social freedom; and even when he is not quite sound, he is always fiercely opposed to the covetousness which calls itself enterprise, smartness, natural incentive to exertion, thrift, and the like.

The whole meaning of the New Testament word "righteousness" has been narrowed down to include only the personal virtues. Yet the word δικαιοσύνη, which is used eighty-six times in the New Testament, has no such limitation. It ought, in the present state of our languuge, to be rendered "justice"; and its opposite, ἀδικία, which is used twenty-five times, should be rendered "injustice." Without this clearly before us, we should never be able to understand the patristic use of Holy Scripture.

St. Clement of Rome† asks the question how we may be found among those who wait for God and receive the promises? and he answers not only that we must be mentally settled Godwards, but also that "we must bring about a state of things agreeable to His holy Will, casting out from us all injustice, anarchy, covetousness, competition, ugly customs and deceitful ways, slanders, detractions and hatred of God, class arrogance, pretence, pomposity, and cliquiness. Those who peddle in such matters are hateful to God — ay, and not only those, but they too who compromise with them." St. Clement‡ pits the sympathy of the Gospel against what some modern Churchmen dare to praise as a thing natural and inevitable, the greed and grab of modern business. Then, again, St. Clement regarded the world to come, not as a mere continuation of this world,

---

* Of course, by "Socialism" we must understand the principles set forth by the "Fabian Essays," and not the mere railing accusations which sometimes usurp the name.

† 1 Cor. xxxv. 2, Leipsic edit. ‡ 2 Cor. iv.

but as its mortal foe. Yet he did not push his revolutionary tenets so far as to neglect present facts. He found rich and poor, and bade the former supply the needs of the latter, and the latter thank God for giving him a helper. We may say that the apostolic Fathers no more elaborated Christian Socialism than they did Catholic theology. But they laid down social principles, and those clearly — St. Clement of Reform; St. Ignatius of Social Union; and St. Polycarp of that Unworldliness without which no great reforms have been or ever will be carried. Yet St. Polycarp pointed out that the greatest obstacle to the work of the Church was money-loving.* St. Ignatius insists upon the power of Christ's grace to break every bond,† and distinctly tells us that indifference to social wrongs and woes is a note of heterodoxy,‡ although he did not specify either the way the bonds were to be broken, or the medicines to be used against social woes. The Shepherd of Hermas is perhaps of a slightly later date than these, if for no other reason, because the social teaching has grown. The rich Christians are there shown to us as round white stones, unfit for building into the Church triumphant until they be squared by the paring off of their riches.§ Indiscriminate alms is insisted upon,‖ and the writer even assumes that the natives of the City of God are likely to lose their lives at the hands of the ruler of this world, "as rebels against his law."

This charge is, of course, the one which alone accounts for the persecutions the Church endured. Other things might be pretexts, but the reason for persecution was that the Faith was suspected of contradicting the constitution, of breeding slave wars, and of denying the sovereignty of Cæsar. Hence the test applied to Christians — the sacrifice to Cæsar, the god of things as they are. Hence too, perhaps, the symbols of the Lamb and the Dove, which marked the spiritual warfare against the Wolf and the Eagle.

We should not be likely under these circumstances to find the Apologists insisting very explicitly upon the social bearing of the Faith. Yet Aristides,¶ in his long-concealed

---

* Phil. iii. 3. † Phila. v. 8. ‡ Smyrn. vi. 2. § Vis. iii. 8.
‖ Sim. i. 6. Compare Διδαχὴ i. 5 and Ap. Constit. vii. 1.
¶ c. xv.

Apology, tells us that the Christians allowed no class distinctions. Athenagoras, who casually admits that Christians held slaves, yet found Plato and his social schemes not to be practical enough. It is not a little curious that both he, Tatian, Theophylus of Antioch, and Hermias, the literary Apologists of the second century, should all ridicule the kings of old philosophy as mere "sky pilots," — the very charge which secularists now bring, not without reason, against some of our clergy. St. Justin Martyr had already explained * that "what human law had been unable to accomplish, the Word came to do"; and that meant, and was understood to mean, that Christ came to fulfil our social and political deficiencies, and therefore to act also upon the plane of politics and the social life. St. Justin boldly applies the second great commandment to equality of possession, even in a stronger way than our modern Socialists would quite relish: "If one really loves one's neighbor as one's self, one will both work and pray to get him all the good things one gets one's self." † Justin's pupil, Tatian, distinctly tells us ‡ that he fell in love with the Church, not only because of the low morality of the Greeks, but because of their political anomalies; "but these are the principles which will free us from our host of rulers, and enable us to have what God has sent for us." The Epistle of Barnabas, which cannot be later than Tatian's time, and which the most educated early Church — the Alexandrine — received as genuine, gives the whole pith of Christian Socialism: § "Thou shalt have all things in common with thy neighbor, and not call them thy private property; for if ye hold the imperishable things in common, how much more the perishable?" Is not this exactly like the words of the Rev. Stewart Headlam: "Those who come to the Holy Communion are bound to be holy Communists"?

Such teaching is all the more striking, and stands out in bolder relief, when we remember that there was no State then, in our sense of the word. There were governors above and subjects below, but the people were not, and indeed are hardly even yet, so organized as to be able to hold common property. Socialists had to be content for a very long time with almsgiving, bounty, and little communes,

---

* Apol. c. xi. † Tryph. 95. ‡ § 29. § cxix. 8.

like the monasteries, in their slow approach to the new Jerusalem of Justice.

Irenæus, St. Polycarp's disciple, continued the same tradition. In his synodical letter from Lyons, he writes: "In whatsoever direction a man can do good to his neighbors and does not do it, he shall be deemed an alien from the love of God." Clemens Alexandrinus was a great and learned writer, and, though no saint, yet necessary to us for the defence of the canon. He has always been beloved of scholars from St. Hilary down to John Selden; and in him we find that enthusiasm for Plato, especially for his Republic, which grew with the Church, as she grew in intellectual stature. Plato is for him the Attic Moses. Plato prefigures the Republic of Christ, St. Chrysostom thought. His teaching is "hardly ever alien from the Church," and he is "the noble philosopher, whose disciples can with very little change bow their necks to Christ," as St. Augustine puts it. His philosophy has not unreasonably been called "the meshing of the gospel net." Clement takes pains to show us that it is Plato's Communism he approves of; and, indeed, so zealous is the Christian author for Socialism, that he actually wrests Holy Scripture on behalf of it. "Pythagoras poetically sums up the Mosaic teaching on justice, when he says one must not turn the balance (*ζυγόν*) of the scales; that is, out of respect to justice one must not overstep equality in distribution.

> 'Friend leans on friend, and State depends on State,
> Each comrade bears about a comrade's fate.
> Equality is man's most natural law;
> But always strife and days of war abide,
> When Have and Have-not live here side by side,' —

as it is poetically put. It was for this that the Lord said, 'Take My yoke (*ζυγόν*) upon you, for it is easy and light'; and to those who were competing about social precedence, He gave one simple word of command — 'equality.' He bade them become as little children. Likewise the Apostle writes that in Christ no one is slave or free, Greek or Jew; for the new creation in Christ is non-competitive, non-covetous, and a just eqality."

The entire condemnation of usury is so strong and so well known, that we need not insist upon that, for the

Church continued her warfare against it until the days of the prophet Jeremy Bentham — so successfully that Renan * accuses her of putting back civilization for a thousand years, because she would not allow that a man may lawfully take what he has neither frankly begged nor fairly earned.

But it is more significant that Clemens utterly departs from Plato on the slavery question.† "We must treat slaves as we do ourselves; for if we would but see it, He is equally the God of the slaves and the free." St. Chrysostom, too, says that, of course, when the Holy Ghost fell upon the Church, the slaves were all manumitted. St. Augustine contends that slavery is as unnatural as sin, and says that no Christian may "own a man, as he would own a horse or money"; and, indeed, it seems to have been a received opinion among primitive believers that, as Innocent I. put it, ‡ "nature bore men free, fortune made men slaves," and a slave "has such treatment as no man would inflict upon himself"; and therefore that the conditions clashed with Christian law — an argument which also admits of wider application.

Of course, Clemens Alexandrinus fell foul of Plato upon the community of wives question. His attitude was that of Tertullian, who sarcastically tells the Imperial pagans: "our Socialism ends just where yours begins." Indeed, the Christian criticism upon the Republic during the first six centuries is singularly unlike that one now hears passed. It is from the standpoint, not of our genteel academies, still less from that of our episcopal palaces, but rather from that of the Guild of St. Matthew. St. Chrysostom, for instance, contrasts Plato's Republic and Christ's: "*His* doctrine can only be understood by the learned, but laborers, sailors, and masons can see ours; his plans are all city ones, but ours do in deserts too; his way needs full-grown men, but ours does even for babes." Or, in loose modern phrase, Plato was an aristocrat, but Christ democratic.

The early Christian writer who most nearly denies the Platonic Communism is Lactantius. "Plato adopted the Socratic teaching that the force of justice resides in equal-

---

* Marcus Aurelius, c. xxxii.

† Ped. iii. 12.

‡ "De Vilitate Conditionis Humanæ."

ity. He says, 'Since all have an equal status at birth, they should own no private property whatsoever; but to get this equality which rational justice demands, they should possess everything in common.' This is sufferable so long as the question is merely one of money; but even that, how impossible and how unjust it is, I could show with much matter. But let it pass, and let us suppose it to be practicable." He then falls savagely upon Plato's proposed community of wives, and shows that it would result in mere anarchy.* But even Lactantius could write thus: "Democritus is praised for throwing up his lands and letting them lapse into public pasture. I should like him if he had given them to the public; but nothing is wisely done, which if it were done all round would be useless and evil." And later on in his life he was wiser still, and gave us plenty of excellent Socialism in his book on "Justice."

Clement of Alexandria, once more, has strong views upon what we should now call women's rights,† holding that as both men and women already have one God, one schoolmaster, one Church, common virtues and common senses, a common grace and a common salvation, equality in the Love-feast and an equal education, so they must have but one moral code.

The thesis that the Christian Church was strongly Socialist in tone at this time, is borne out not only by the attacks of her enemies, but by the exaggerations of heretics.

We have already noticed the great fact of the persecutions, which sifted the *cæremonia illicita* from the *cæremonia licita*, and decided that our Faith was one of the worships which contradict the constitution. Let us now turn our attention to Clement's great pupil, Origen, and his controversy with Celsus. The gravest charge made by the latter against the Church was "that the Christian and the Jewish religions both originated in revolution (στάσις)." ‡

The charge was cleverly made, for "Israel came out of Egypt" with something very like a great brickmakers' strike, and the Christian Society is assuredly one which aims at turning the world upside down. Origen's answer was first a challenge to his opponent to name any armed rising

---

* "De falsa Sapientiâ," lib. iii.

† Ped. i. 4.

‡ Origen (Migne), iii. 7, p. 451.

the Christians had caused; and secondly, an appeal to Christ's law, which works no violence, nor does men to death; but the defence evades the gist of the charge, and merely emphasizes the fact — possibly well known to Celsus — that the Church does not appeal to that clumsy weapon the sword.

As to the exaggeration of heretics, we may mention Epiphanes and Basilides, who both taught Communism very much in the acrid spirit of some of our anti-religious Socialists. Among other things, those heretics, like some modern writers, laughed to scorn the notion that one should not lust after one's neighbor's wife; and when they were confuted, since this was the only tenet which was attacked, may we not say that the rest of their teaching, though not their tone, was approved by implication?

Origen, in his zeal for allegory, often dissolves the plain New Testament denunciations of the rich into warnings against the pride of intellect, and makes the blessings pronounced upon the poor fall upon the head of the Gentiles. Nevertheless, when he does take these literally, his fierceness of invective against those "unclean and twisty camels" the rich, knows no limits, and he bears emphatic testimony to the fact that the Word teaches equality. "As you can see in most of the orthodox Churches, especially in the large towns, the leaders of God's people take no precedence; and they make no exception even for the most perfect disciples of Jesus." *

We are now passing on to the Arian heresy and the times of the Greek Doctors. This heresy, for all its subtilty, not only had a political and social bearing, but this side of it was to the civic authorities the chief side. The question as to whether the Divine Son was in any way inferior in essence to the Eternal Father, meant, in effect: Is the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church, in any way inferior to that Natural Society, the State, which in its way expresses the natural order, and God the Father? In other words, is the Empire to rule the Church, or to get out of her way? This is why the emperors were Arians. This is why the Imperial party first pooh-poohed the Catholics, and then persecuted them with such inconceivable

* iii. § 724.

fury. The history of the fourth century is no less a history of social reformers fighting against reaction because the battle was fought out in the schools and on the lofty plane of accurate and technical theology. SS. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Athanasius were none the less Socialist because they were fighting for the very citadel of fundamental theory and not for mere legal applications. Often they declare the same themselves. St. Basil, for instance, says bluntly that "the Word calls us to socialism, altruism, and realism" * (or correspondence with Nature), "for man is a social and an interdependent animal." So far from thinking poverty and slavery to be natural and inevitable, these Fathers regarded them as the diseases which were bred of sin, and which the Church has been founded to cure. Here is St. Gregory Nazianzen's view: — †

"Do let us remember God's law, which is highest and first. He rains upon the just and upon sinners, and makes His sun to rise upon all alike. He has prepared the earth, field, springs, rivers, and woods for all the dwellers upon dry land; the air for the winged things, and the water for those whose life is of that. He has given the necessaries of life to all jointly, without limit or stint; not impossibly conditioned or legally hedged, not prescribed by partitions; but He has bestowed the same in common and richly, and has left no want unsupplied. He regards the natural equality of rank by an equality of gift, and displays the riches of His kindness. But men must needs get gold and silver, and all sorts of soft clothes, and useless shining stones, and all such matters, which are the symbols of war and rebellion and tyranny. With these they are stupidly elated, and shut up their mercy against their kindred in distress, and refuse to succor them even with necessities out of their own superfluities. What blockishness! What stupidity! Whatever we do, pray let us reflect that poverty and riches, what we call freedom and slavery, and similarly named things, are later effects on the race of men. They are the common diseases which have fallen upon our baseness, and the symptoms of that. But in the beginning it was not so. He who first formed man, made him free and a master, bound only by the law of God's commandment, and rich in the lux-

---

* In Psalm xiv. 6. † xiv. 25, Oratio.

ury of Paradise. All this He wished to bestow upon the rest of mankind, who should spring from the first man's seed."

St. Athanasius also is far from thinking that the Divine Word operates only in the sphere of the personal and immaterial life, and provides some ready-made hereafter for those who have despaired of God's Republic here. He goes out of his way to tell us that the work of atonement would be incomplete, and Christ would not have received His due, unless all things were given Him, including the earth, including food and rest for the workers and burden bearers; and that if we did not have rest and food, the primal curse would not be removed.*

While SS. Athanasius, Gregory, and Basil were defending the Catholic theory, St. Chrysostom was speaking to the common people, and speaking clear and concrete things. Take his sixth sermon on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. He is examining into the checks which the Church has received, though the Word abides still with her, and concludes that these checks have come, not because we have no miracles, but because we have let go the Pentecostal Communism, "the angelic life," and fallen back on private property. "But if we lived as they did (with all things in common), we should soon convert the whole world, with no need of miracles at all." Indeed, St. Chrysostom is full of the plainest and most emphatic Socialism. Take his explanation of *πλεονεξία*, covetousness,† as the desire for more things than those to which our faculties can correspond, — over-endowment we might call it; whereas *Φιλαργυρία* is that "thrift" which is now preached to the poor as a virtue, and practised by those of us whose wills are sworn under such huge sums. St. Chrysostom was always impressing upon people that the Communion which the Apostles taught "was not only a matter of prayer and doctrine, but extended into their political and social relations." ‡

In his eleventh sermon on the Acts, St. Chrysostom points out that private bounty tends to vainglory, but the early Christians gave in their corporate capacity, — nationalizing everything, as we should say. Waxing warm over

---

* Migne's Athan., i. p. 212. † Hom. xxv. Acts. ‡ Hom. vii. Acts.

that beautiful text, "Great grace was upon them all, neither was there any that lacked," he points out that thus and thus only can we get great grace. He thunders against social inequalities. He points out how all could be made rich by a total renunciation of private property. Amid the cheers and groans of his hearers, he sketches the effects of the Apostolic Communism applied to his own city; urges that if it were possible when believers were so few, much more is it possible now; and he then descends into political economy, and shows how much cheaper co-operative methods are than separative and competitive ones. To St. Chrysostom the Christian warfare was no scramble for the best in a hereafter. It was a war of emancipation here.* He had a keen sense of the horrors of competition, and is as furious at it in laborers and hucksters as in society ladies and merchant princes.†

If the Greek writers excelled in *ἐπίγνωσις*, the Latins bear the bell for *αἴσθησις*. If the former are deeper, quicker, and more subtle, the latter put their principles more immediately to work. In them, too, it is true to say that they are Socialist in exact proportion to their orthodoxy.

Tertullian, in his Apology,‡ redeems a rather conservative and questionable passage, wherein he prays for "the delay of the end" by a splendid passage upon the fraternity, which Christians so believed in, that they extended it even to their pagan persecutors. "Why, we are even brothers in income, the very question which almost tears your fraternity to tatters. So we, who are one in mind and soul, make no balk at common property. Everything we have is our common and equal property, except wives. Our Socialism ends just where yours begins." St. Cyprian§ insists that none of the gifts of God are given us to be our private property, or ought to be claimed to the exclusion of others. The land and its products ought to be as common to men as are the sun, clouds, winds, sleep, stars, and moon; and he calls upon landlords and crop-lords to use these, as God shows how, for the common benefit. That this is "bounty" and not "State Socialism" is, of course,

---

* Ephes. vi. † Hom. x. 1 Thess.
‡ Ap. 39. § "De Opere et Eleemosynis."

only because, as we have said, the State, in our sense of the word, was not yet evolved.

St. Jerome again and again points out that salvation without active labor is impossible,* and ordered the Egyptian monasteries to let no one off his work and labor. Indeed, the monastic life altogether is itself a witness to the fact that throughout the ages the Church has believed that the higher life is inconsistent with private property.

St. Ambrose, too, held opinions which would certainly have brought him into no little trouble in the modern Church. This is how he regards the fowls of heaven: "They are a great example, truly, and one worthy of our faithful imitation; for if God's providence never fails to supply the fowls of heaven, albeit they use no husbandry, and trouble nothing about the prospects of the harvest, the true cause of our want would seem to be avarice. It is for this reason that they have an abundance of suitable victuals, because they have not learnt to claim as their private and peculiar property the fruits of the earth, which have been given to them in common for their food. We have lost common property by the claims of private property. Yet nothing can be one's own, when all is so transitory; nor can there be an assured plenty, when the disposal of it is uncertain." This is how he meditates upon Naboth, the Jezreelite: "How far will your mad lusts take you, ye rich people? Till you dwell alone upon the earth? Why do you at once turn Nature out-of-doors, and claim the possession of her for your own selves? The land was made for all; why do you rich men claim it as your private property? Nature knows nothing of rich men: she bore us all poor." With this we can compare another passage: † "The philosophers thought that justice might be defined as keeping common or public things for public purposes, and private ones for individual uses. This is quite unnatural, for Nature lavished all things for all in common. So, likewise, God bade all things to be produced, that all should have common pasture, and the land should be a kind of property common to all men. Nature, then, produced common property; robbery made private property."

---

* Cf. "Ep. ad Rusticum Mon."

† "De Off. Minist." cap. xxviii.

Proudhon himself could have hardly put it more bluntly; and these are no isolated instances. Justice is as much associated by St. Ambrose with nationalized property as it is with Plato himself.

St. Augustine was not one whit behind his great teacher.* "That is a most harmful counsel which a man gives to himself — to seek his own, and not the things which are God's. But in His heritage, because He is ours, when He deigns for our solace to manifest Himself, we with the saints shall suffer none of the social miseries which come from love of what is our own, the so-called private property. Indeed, that most glorious city of God, when she comes into her promised inheritance, where none is born and none can die, will not have citizens who privately enjoy their separate possessions, for God will be all in all. And whosoever in this our pilgrimage faithfully and earnestly has longed for His society, makes a practice of always preferring common things to private ones, seeking not his own, but the things which are Jesus Christ's." In a similar vein he interprets the psalm *Memento David.* If a man has a house or bed of his own, he will never find or be a "place for the Lord." "Private property is the cause of lawsuits, jars, duels, revolutions, party feuds, scandals, sins, injustice, and murders"; and "so let us keep from private property altogether, or, if that is impracticable, at least from the love of it."

St. Augustine also struck a note which the Church has never let die, and which is a death-knell to the pseudo-social reforms, such as vegetarianism, teetotalism, and the like. "It was not for pork, but for pippins, that the first man met death; and Esau lost his birthright, not for poultry, but for pottage. I know, too, that Noah was given for food, all kinds of flesh which can be eaten; that Elijah was refreshed with flesh food; and that John, endowed as he was with marvellous abstinence, was not defiled with the animals — to wit, locusts, — which fell to his food. Yes, I know Esau was deceived with the lust of pottage; and David severely rebuked himself for his desire for water; and that our King was tempted not with butcher's meat, but with bread." †

---

* Enarr. in Psalm cv. (Vulg.).

† Cf. S. Bernard *in Apologetic.*

St. Leo, in one of his sermons, lays down the usual maxim that collective property is always to be preferred before private property, because the general watch and ward over it is more likely to secure a right use of it.

There is one author with whom we may fittingly close this essay, St. Gregory the Great, the friend of the English. Both the necessity of his unhappy, disorderly time, and his own ruling spirit, tended to make him a friend to authority and a foe to innovation. His teaching upon social subjects is cautious, and he tries to balance his utterances. If he tells us that riches are very dangerous to the spiritual life, he almost immediately tells us that the faithful Abraham was rich.* If he tells us that the Gospel calls equally to men of every class, he is careful to add that to each type of character the call comes in a different manner.† If he has to point out that men who have heard the voice of God often defy the powers that be, he is careful to show that they also burn with charity towards those whom they rebuke. ‡

Yet St. Gregory, in his "Pastoralis Cura,"— a book which "has always been a text-book for the formation of members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy," § and which, more than any of his works, bears the mark of extreme care and compressed thought, — distinctly explains his theory of almsgiving, and explains it from a strongly socialist standpoint. This is all the more telling, because the boundless generosity of the saint, and his severe attention to sympathetic almsgiving, are the keynotes of his whole life. He was more renowned for his almsdeeds even than for anything else in his strenuous and valorous career; and those who came after him blamed him, if for anything, for a chairity which exceeded his very powers of giving. His words to those who are called upon to teach the Faith are these: ‖ "This is how we must preach to those who neither covet other men's goods nor yet bestow their own in alms. We must make them clearly understand that the land which yields them income is the common property of all men, and for this reason the fruits of it which are brought forth are for

---

* Magna Moralia, iv. 60, 61; x. 41–49. † Ibid., vi. 21, 22.
‡ Ibid, vii. 53, 54. § Father H. J. Coleridge, Preface to Dialogues.
‖ De Cura Pastorali, Tertia pars. c. xxi.

the common welfare. It is therefore absurd for people to think they do no harm when they claim God's common gift of food as their private property, or that they are not robbers, when they do not pass on what they have received to their neighbors. Absurd! because almost as many folk die daily as they have rations locked up for at home. Really, when we administer any necessities to the poor, we give them their own; we do not bestow our goods upon them. We do not fulfil the works of mercy; we discharge the debt of justice. Hence it was that Very Truth, when He told us to be careful to show mercy, said, 'See that ye do not your justice before men.' In harmony with this the psalmist too said, 'He hath dispersed, He hath given to the poor, His justice remaineth for ever.' For when he reviewed a lavish generosity to the poor, he chose to call it justice rather than mercy, because what is given us by a common God is only justly used when those who have received it use it in common. Such people must also be told to consider carefully the barren fig tree. The husbandman quarrelled with it, because it merely held the land. Indeed, a barren fig tree holds the land when the mind of the owners idly keeps what could benefit so many. A barren fig tree holds the land when a fool overcasts with the shadow of his inactivity a place which another could use with the sunshine of good work."

It is with social teaching of this sort that the English people received their Church, — teaching which was no idle whim of a few loose thinkers, but the settled conviction of the highest and saintliest of the Church's own teachers. And when, after a long winter of protestant discontent and commercial individualism, such teaching is once more found among us, we might expect that our leading and most learned Churchmen would welcome it indeed. Such, unhappily, is not yet the case.

THE FATHERS ON PROPERTY.

By the Rev. W. F. Cobb.

An attempt has recently been made to claim the high authority of the Fathers for the doctrines of the Fabian Society, for "the frankest Socialism," for community of goods, and against the lawfulness of private property. The Fathers are so widely and so justly regarded as unimpeachable witnesses to the purity of Evangelical truth, that it is important to ascertain whether they did hold as a body any theories about economic problems which satisfy the test of *quod ab omnibus*. Of course no one regards the private opinions of the Fathers as having more weight than those of any other fallible and good men. Take, for instance, the austere and fervent, but also narrow and violent, monk of Bethlehem, St. Jerome. We do not feel bound to follow his exhortation to Furia to "repel a singer like some poison"; nor, when he tells Læta to let her daughter Paula be "deaf to the sound of the organ, and not know even the uses of the pipe, the lyre, and the cithern," do we regard this as a command binding for all time; much less when he declares that chastity forbids a maiden ever to take a bath, or when he praises the mother of Eustochium because, after the death of her husband, she never sat down to meat with a man. These are local and temporary opinions, interesting as historical documents, but of little interest beyond that.

What is claimed for the alleged social teaching of the Fathers goes far beyond the irresponsible dicta of illustrious individuals. We are assured that collectivism is an integral part of the Catholic deposit, or, if not part of its essence, at all events a "property" of it, a beloved friend never to be found absent from its sworn companion. Thus, for instance, we are assured —

> "where the Catholic faith is merely latent, there the Socialiam is also less explicit. When the writer is unsound in his orthodoxy (*sic*), there he is almost sure to favor some form of individualist law or possession."

This is to force Christianity to stake her all on one throw of the dice. If she teaches individualism in any shape,

then she is heretical, or apostate, or not divine. Those, however, who have watched in history one shibboleth after another raised to the status of an *articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ* will view with equanimity the elevation of another to imperial rank, and will calmly await the moment when its pretensions are exposed, and its real worth accurately gauged. The issue put before us *hic et nunc* is whether undiluted collectivism, or competitive individualism in all its nakedness, or a *tertium quid*, individualism limited by socialism, is the system of economic living favored by the early Fathers.

The question is likely to be usefully narrowed by the patent consideration that the first and chiefest interests of the early Christians were religious and ethical rather than social or economic. They regarded themselves as the torch-bearers of a revelation from God to man, whereby the road from earth to heaven was at last made clear, and the weary voyager endowed with strength and will to go on his upward way. They held, moreover, that this revelation was not offered to isolated individuals, in such a sense that those who accepted its guidance had no interest in one another. On the contrary, a religious gift common to all involved social obligations. Charity, like Janus, had two faces, of which one was turned towards God and the other towards man. But though they both belonged to the same owner, though both expressed the same spirit, though both were essentially equal, yet there was a priority of order, and the love of man was a consequence of the love of God, and not *vice versa*. "This commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God love his brother also." The importance of this consideration will appear directly.

If we are to find the social teaching of the Fathers anywhere, we should look for it especially in their exhortations about the use of money. And here their teaching is singularly rich. The only difficulty is that caused by an *embarras des richesses*. A few specimens taken at random from their works will show their economic leaning better than pages of description. St. Clement of Rome says —

"Let the rich minister aid to the poor; and let the poor give thanks to God, because He has given him one through whom his wants may be supplied."[1]

[1] *Ep.*, § 39.

St. Irenæus, in denouncing the party of Simon and Carpocrates, declares that the Lord ordered us to be —

"so far from denying another man's ownership in things, as even to refrain from demanding our own back from such as may have taken them," [1]

which sanctions involuntary almsgiving in its crudest form.

Justin Martyr, in describing the worship of his day, says —

"Of those that are well to do and willing, every one gives what he will according to his own purpose, and the collection is deposited with the president, and he it is that succours orphans and widows." [2]

In a similar way, Tertullian says—

"Each of us puts in a trifle on the monthly day, or when he pleases; but only if he pleases, and only if he is able, for no man is obliged, but contributes of his own free-will." [3]

One more instance may suffice. St. Augustine, preaching on the words "The gold is Mine and the silver is Mine," says —

"Let him, who is unwilling to share his goods with the poor, understand, when he hears exhortations to show mercy, that God does not order him to give of his own but of that which is God's." [4]

One thing is clear from the teaching of the Fathers on almsgiving, of which the above extracts are fair samples; and that is, that they regarded God as the sole absolute owner of all things, the rich as His stewards, the poor as His pensioners, and riches itself as "the touchstone of humanity, the punishment of lust;" but they never breathe a hint of their latent belief that society was wrongly constituted; that mankind was unjustly divided into the oppressing rich and the oppressed poor, and that when Christianity was victorious "collectivism" would take the place of individual possession and pecuniary inequality. Their appeals are invariably made to the individual conscience, not to a collectivist future when all shall share and share alike, and the very fact that their appeal is of this kind is the strongest testimony to their ingrained individ-

---

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, lib. ii., c. 32.
[2] *Apol.*, i. 67.
[3] *Ibid.*, c. 39.
[4] *Serm.* 4, tom. v., p. 326 (Migne).

ualism. It may be described as unorthodox, or as bordering on heresy, if you please, but it is there.

This inference is supported, too, by many passages in which the Fathers are led to state explictly their economic views. They point to the bounty of God, to the free access given to earth and air and water, to the wasteful extravagance of *Laissez faire*, to the wickedness of confiscation, to the proper use of temporal things, but never to the duty of teaching community of goods as one of the precepts of the gospel. For example, St. Chrysostom, when commenting on Acts iv. 32, a passage which, if any, would impel the preacher to state explicitly the binding force of collectivism, contents himself with praising "the exceeding ardour of the givers," and with urging that, if the same thing were done by his hearers, they would live more cheaply, and the poor would be provided for. Indeed, a few pages further on, when dealing with the case of Ananias, all that Chrysostom says is —

"Sacrilege, beloved, is a most grievous crime, insulting and full of contempt. 'We neither obliged thee to sell,' the Apostle says, 'nor to give thy money when thou hadst sold; of thine own free choice thou didst it; why hast thou then stolen from the sacred treasury? . . . Didst thou wish to keep it? Thou oughtest to have kept it all along, and never to have professed to give it.'"

Again, his constant conception of riches as private property entrusted to each man by God comes out in his homily on St. John xvii. 5 —

"Riches are called *usables*, that we may *use* them rightly, and not keep and bury them; for this is not to possess them but to be possessed by them. . . . Let us then free ourselves from this grievous bondage, and at last become free. . . . So many hindrances are there; that we may conquer them all let us keep to the mean estate."[1]

St. Gregory, in his *Morals*,[2] expresses the unanimous opinion of the Fathers on the ethical meaning of property:

"We often see rich people, who might have had wealth and glory without guilt, if they would have had them with humility. But they

[1] The writer of the very sane leaflet, No. 15, published by the Oxford University Branch of the Christian Social Union, will be glad to have the above support of St. Chrysostom for his statement that, "granting the necessity and desirability of different standards of comfort, the highest permanently justifiable mode of living will perhaps be more nearly that usual among professional men of moderate means than that of the wealthiest classes." — Chrysostom's εὐτελεία, in fact.

[2] Lib. xiv., § 19.

are uplifted by possessions, they are flushed with honours, they disdain the rest of the world, and place their life's whole hope and trust in the mere abundance of good things alone."

But how could they possess their wealth without guilt if community of goods is ordered to accompany the reception of the gospel? or how can St. Gregory be acquitted of trifling with heresy if any form of "individualist law or possession" is a mark of unorthodoxy?

A passage from Irenæus has a special bearing upon our present subject, because he is directly dealing with the question of the private possession of goods. Answering the charge of dishonesty brought against the Israelites for spoiling the Egyptians, he urges that what they did they did under the command of God, and proceeds to say —

"Had not God permitted this in the typical journey, no man could at this day be saved in our real journey, *i. e.* in the faith wherein we are established, whereby we are taken out of the number of the Gentiles. For we are all accompanied by some property, moderate or large, which we have gotten out of the Mammon of iniquity."[1]

A little further on, Irenæus is even stronger. For he declares that, if a man from a Gentile become a Christian, and live homeless and barefoot, "he will obtain pardon as not knowing what is needed in our manner of life." The same ingenuity which makes the Fathers communists, may easily make the above passage to condemn St. Francis of Assisi for teaching utter poverty.

One more passage, and this from St. Ambrose, may be examined, and the more carefully, because no patristic statement appears to make more for community of goods than this. He is discussing the four Platonic cardinal virtues,[2] and observes that justice, according to the Stoics, is defined as hurting no one unless provoked to it by some injury, which, he says, is a mere passive virtue, and beneath the Christian virtue, which is actively beneficent. Then, he says, they have again treated justice as if it meant that by it public rights are held to be public, and private private. But this, he says again, is contrary to that nature to which Stoics are always appealing —

"For nature has given all things to all men in common; for God has ordained that all things shall be so produced that food shall be

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, lib. iv., c. 30. [2] *De Officiis*, lib. i., c. 28.

common to all, and the earth as it were the common possession of all. Nature, therefore, is the mother of common right, appropriation [*usurpatio*] of private. Hence the favourite saying of the Stoics, that the fruits of the earth were created for the use of men, but men were made for the sake of men, viz. that they might be of mutual service to one another."

Then, after a reference to Eve being given to Adam as a helpmate, St. Ambrose draws his conclusion —

"Therefore, according to the will of God or the bond of nature, we are bound to help one another, to vie with one another in kindly offices, and, as it were, put all our resources into one heap [*in medio omnes utilitates ponere*]; in the words of Scripture, to help one another, by kindliness, by service, by money, by good works, in every way, that social feeling may grow, and no one be called from his duty even by fear of danger, but that each may go on his own way, whether of prosperity or adversity."

How strong was the Christian tradition for an individualism tempered only by Christian love may be seen from the hiatus between the premises and the conclusion of this extract. By nature all things are common, says St. Ambrose; their divisions into parcels of private property is not of nature, but of history. Therefore, what? Return, as Rousseau did, to the state of nature? No, let the present constitution of things remain. But let Christians be ready to help one another with their purse. St. Ambrose, in laying thus an individualistic basis for property, was not deliberately flying in the face of Christian tradition. Nay, he does not seem to be aware that there was any Christian tradition at all which concerned itself with those economic problems that disturb our industrial age.

Some idea may now be had of the bearing of a previous remark, that the early Church's concern was chiefly with religion and ethics. In the light of the passages already quoted, it is not too much to say that the economic side of the gospel — that is to say, the theories of the distribution of wealth which the establishment of Christianity must inevitably call into being — had, for the Fathers, no existence at all. Their minds were too full of the other world and its glories to take much account of this, except so far as it was the vestibule to heaven. Economic problems, and even social ethics, are the children of later-born parents, and see the light under conditions which were utterly wanting to the first three centuries of our era.

Three other converging lines of argument may be briefly traced as leading us to the same conclusion. (1) The persistency with which the doctrine of a millennium survived in the Church is proof that under it was something more than a particular interpretation of passages that proclaim a first resurrection. It is true that Chiliasm was never held by more than a small fraction of Christians; it is probably true that the condemnation of it by Origen and Caius and Dionysius, on the ground of its sensuality, is an exaggeration. But to every caricature there is a substratum of truth. And the doctrine which charmed some few Christians in early days into Chiliasm was in all likelihood the alluring prospect of an earthly Paradise where greed, and envy, and oppression — and shall we add money and private property? — were not known, but where justice, judgment, and truth were supreme under King Jesus. It appears that this lofty vision is that which is tempting some of the nobler souls among us to try to build Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land, oblivious of the fact that to mortals it is not given to do more than yearn and strive for the ideal, and that ideals *ex vi termini* never can be fully and adequately realized, save in an ideal world.

2. The second buttress for my argument is derived from the grounds on which the early Christians incurred the wrath of the civil power. Professor Ramsay has so conclusively dealt with this head that it will be enough to point out that it was "the Name" which was obnoxious to the Emperors. It led to riots, as at Ephesus; it interfered with trade, as at Philippi; it emptied the heathen temples, as in Bithynia; it broke into the civil system by insisting on an origin for religion higher than the imperial will; it set up a heavenly King, over whom the haughty Cæsar had no sway. But Christianity was not charged with being anarchical on socialistic or economic grounds. The head and forefront of its offending was its audacious and inflexible assertion of the rights of the individual to obey spiritual truth. For example, there is not a word in the account of the sufferings of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, as given by the Church there, to show that the magistrates punished them on any grounds but those of professing unauthorized religion. In the rescript of Gallienus it is liberty of religious worship alone that is specified as conferred by it. The

same is true of the Toleration Edict of Galerius as given by Lactantius. The Edict of Milan put forth by Constantine and Licinius is express on this point: —

"We thought that, amongst other things which seemed likely to profit men generally, we ought in the very first place to set in order the conditions of the reverence paid to the Divinity, by giving to the Christians and all others full authority to follow whatever worship any man has chosen. . . . Therefore we thought it good, with sound counsel and very right reason, to lay down this law that no man whatever should be refused any legal facility, who has given up his mind either to the observance of Christianity, or to the worship which he personally feels best suited to himself."

The Emperors punished Christians as disorderly, but the disorder they caused was like that of the "Ritualists"; they denied the authority of Cæsar to legislate in religious matters for individual consciences. Had the civil power been able to point to them as fanatical communists it would eagerly have done so. But had the Christians been nothing else save communists the issue would have been reversed — Christianity would have been crushed, and no Constantine would have been the first Christian Emperor.

3. Monasticism is sometimes appealed to as an irrefragable proof of the communistic tendency always present in the Church, but not fully manifested till the Churches had quieted. But this is at best a two-edged weapon. It may be as plausibly maintained that you have to go to monks of a much later date, say the seventh century, before you can find any expression of a belief that monasticism was a necessary means of salvation. To the Church at large it was not, and never could be, more than a counsel of perfection — that is to say, a way of life to which some few might be called, and from which it follows, therefore, that the rest were absolved.

Community of goods, the wrongfulness of individualism, may be defended on other grounds. But what is not legitimate is a reading of history backwards, and the attributing to men, whose whole mind was turned upon a religious revolution, ideas and aspirations which they would not have understood. If ever they were led to mention the distribution of wealth, they invariably treated their subject from the point of view of Teachers of Religion, and not of Professors of Political Economy. They appealed to individuals

to remember the duties of property; they would have been horrified at the doctrine of "ransom," and would have denounced Proudhon's maxim, "*La propriété c'est le vol*," as an incitement to break the Eighth Commandment. On the other hand, they were so far from being advocates of *Laissez faire* that they passionately exhorted to brotherly liberality; they never dreamed of community of goods as within the domain of practical politics; what they really did was to assert individualism in its strongest form, but individualism tempered and limited by Christian love of man as man.

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

PRESIDENT.

The Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S. T. D.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

The Rt. Rev. Wm. Lawrence, D. D.
The Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, D. D.
The Rev. Robert A. Holland, S. T. D.
The Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D. D.
Prof. Richard T. Ely, Ph. D.
Mr. George E. McNeill.

SECRETARY.

The Rev. George Hodges, D. D.,
Diocesan House, Boston, Mass.

TREASURER.

Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, Diocesan House, Boston, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Rev. J. W. Suter, *Chairman.*

Prof. W. J. Ashley, M. A.
Mr. Edmund Billings.
The Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.
The Rev. C. H. Brent.
The Rev. W. L. Bull.
Mr. Francis Watts Lee.
The Rev. Prof. H. S. Nash, D. D.
The Rev. Philo W. Sprague.
The Rev. Floyd W. Tompkins, Jr.
Mr. John W. Wood.

COUNCIL.

The foregoing and
The Rt. Rev. H. M. Thompson, S.T.D.
The Rt. Rev. Davis Sessums, D. D.
The Rev. Arthur Brooks, D. D.
Prof. James H. Dillard.
Miss Helena S. Dudley.
The Rev. W. B. Frisby.
The Rev. Prof. E. P. Gould, D. D.
The Rev. Percy S. Grant.
The Rev. George Hodge.
Mr. James L. Houghteling.
Mr. William P. Johnston, LL. D.
The Rev. A. R. Kieffer.
The Rev. J. S. Lindsay, D. D.
The Rev. Arthur A. Lowndes.
Mr. J. Bleeker Miller.
The Rev. Henry Mottet, D. D.
The Rev. R. Heber Newton, D. D.
The Rev. E. N. Potter, D. D.
Miss Vida D. Scudder.
Mr. Archibald L. Sessions.
The Rev. H. H. Sleeper, Ph. D.
The Rev. Wm. Harman Van Allen.
The Rev. Geo. R. Van De Water, D.D.
Mr. Everett P. Wheeler.
The Rev. John Williams.
Mr. George Zabriskie.

OBJECTS. — 1. To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. 2. To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time. 3. To present Christ in practical life as the living Master and King, the Enemy of wrong and selfishness, the Power of righteousness and love.

MEMBERSHIP is open to all communicants of the Episcopal Church upon application to the Secretary and the payment of one dollar per annum.

PUBLICATIONS. — A semi-monthly series of Publications is issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee, but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

SUBSCRIPTION to the Publications, one dollar per annum. Special rate to members: Annual Dues and Subscription to the Publications both at one time, strictly in advance, one dollar.

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 8. | NOVEMBER 1, 1895. | PER ANNUM, $1.00. SINGLE NUMBERS, 10c.

THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY IN THE CITY TODAY.

AN ADDRESS BY THE REV. W. S. RAINSFORD, D.D.,

RECTOR OF ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH, NEW YORK,

Delivered before the Church Club of the Diocese of Long Island, on Monday Evening, January 28, 1895.

BOSTON:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

THE DIOCESAN HOUSE,

1 JOY STREET.

1895.

PUBLICATIONS.

The following papers have appeared, or will shortly appear, in the Publications of the Union. They may be had from the Secretary at ten cents each. Subscription, one dollar per annum.

SERIES A.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.
Rev. R. A. Holland, S.T.D.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY IN RELATION TO THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH.
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D.

THE INCARNATION A REVELATION OF HUMAN DUTIES.
Rt. Rev. B. F. Westcott, D.D.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
Joseph Mazzini.

WHAT THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION IS.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY FATHERS. (Two views.)
Revs. C. L. Marson and W. F. Cobb.

THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY IN THE CITY TO-DAY.
Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D.D.

SERIES B.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE OF 1894.
Prof. W. J. Ashley, M.A.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIME.
Prof. Henry C. Adams, Ph.D.

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.
Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND PRACTICAL LIFE.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

STRIKES.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

A PLAN OF WORK.

THE SLUMS OF GREAT CITIES AND THEIR PROBLEMS.
Rev. P. W. Sprague.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR STUDENTS.

AN EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

AMERICAN TRADES UNIONS.

These Publications are issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee; but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

Important Notice to Members on Page 15.

"THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY IN THE CITY TODAY."

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CHURCH CLUB OF LONG ISLAND:

I think all of us are perhaps even already in a position to recognize and appreciate the value of such organizations as this, the home-coming of which we are met together tonight to celebrate. These times call for just such opportunities as can be afforded by our Church Clubs—times of frankest and fullest expression of opinions that may be very diverse.

I remember my first introduction to a Clerical Club. It was not a Church Club in the sense in which you are. It was a Clerical Club, which is apt to be a somewhat narrow institution. My first introduction to a Clerical Club—I don't think there was a Church Club in this country then—it was twenty years ago. I won't give away that clerical organization by mentioning the name of the town; but I shall never forget my introduction. I was brought in by a venerable presbyter, and my very callow youth contrasted with his rich and ripe age, and making a sweep of his hand and presenting me to the more than forty clergymen present, he said: "My young brother, I rejoice to have an opportunity to present you to forty gentlemen who see eye to eye." I need not tell you the city in which that occurred. Some of you can guess it. I don't think that a similar introduction could be made of a similar callow youth to a similar forty today; because I do not believe there is any society or club that has to do in any direct way with the tremendous issues that are pending, with the momentous questions that are arising and have arisen, with the great variety of adaptation with which they should and must be met—no one, surely, gentlemen, could possibly expect that an active life, a vigorous attack on evil and a perfect championship of truth could by any conceivable possibility result in forty men seeing eye to eye.

Church Clubs should be places where men can meet who have only one or two great things in common—love, we hope, for the Master, love for the Master's work, and loyalty to that great Church under which and in connection with which we do believe we can best glorify Him and best serve humanity. This should be the basis on which we discuss, and then our meetings will be fraught with advantage to ourselves and we believe with some advantage to our great communities. Now, this I take to be the part that the Church Club life is going o play in our community; and it surely is an important one.

I say these few words in preface, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, because I feel that I have very special reasons, if I may be allowed to say so, for urging this view, this side of the importance of Church Clubs. I find myself on a great many questions that come up and are discussed in them, sometimes an outsider; and yet, if you will pardon a moment's digression on a personal subject, I find that as the years go on—I have been in this country now since 1876—I find that there are more outsiders than I knew. I am almost inclined to think that the outsiders are sometimes like the stone of the Australian cherry. The stone grows outside, and the cherry can't do without the stone. I think that we are coming in our Church to recognize as essential, the stupendous depth and length and breadth and height that is in a body which has her roots so firmly in the past as we have. The more firmly we are attached to the past, the more truly can we live in the present and expand toward the future. And any view of the historic Church which fails to recognize that, fails to recognize her true strength and true position. Wherever I go in this country (and it has been my lot to wander far more widely over it than most), I find men of intelligence and devotion everywhere turning to her, turning with anxiety, turning with hopefulness,—turning with a very great hopefulness, because they feel that we have at least a breadth and a comprehensiveness by reason of which perhaps some of them who thought they would be obliged to stand outside the organic Christian Church, can learn to find a place within.

Now this position, it seems to me, we ought to be able to help people to take; this position for our Church we want to see clearly ourselves; and if we do, we need ask ourselves the question: How shall we, as faithful servants of a branch of the historic Church, set ourselves to help that splendid organization in which we have a part? How shall we seek to recommend this great branch of the Church Catholic to the growing, developing life of our sixty-five millions of people?

Now there are many sides to this subject. There are many directions in which we may be expected to extend our activity. But when we compare and think, when we look at the different quarters of the field, cast our eyes over them and ask ourselves: Where shall we best as wise husbandmen sow the seed that has been entrusted us to sow? How shall we best go about shepherding the flock which God has given us to shepherd? How shall we best lay to interest the talents—two, five, ten, one—that God has given us?—then arises time for counsel. Then we want to hear the voice of those who are men, who know the country, know something of the day, know something of what is in men's hearts, know something of men's views, know something of men's needs.

Now I cannot but feel very strongly that, however we may deplore it, there is no atom of fear for the decay—even the temporary decay—of religion. I do not see how men can believe in God and fear for that. There *is* a very grave danger of a falling away from *organic* religion. My experience only goes back as a clergyman to 1872 when I was ordained. My experience as a layman working in the slums of Bethel Green goes back before this to 1866. when, as a boy I spent much of my time there. Since that time I can see a very great falling away of the multitudes from *organic* Christianity.

I will even limit my observation to the brief time since I came to New York in 1882. I can see, Mr. Chairman, since 1882, a very great change in the city of New York. I see today that it is very much harder to get people to church than it was in 1882 in New York. I don't know how you are in Brooklyn, but I know how it is in New York and in the West. I think the church-going habits remain stronger in the South than anywhere else. But in this section of the country and in the West there is a very definite falling away from organic religion.

I don't think there is any falling away in the religious feeling of the people. I don't think there is a doubt that in these late years there is even a decided growth of the religious spirit, if you define the religious spirit as most of us would define it in the broad sense—*the desire to give the best we have to the best we know.* There are a great many definitions of religion, but it seems to me that is as good a one as I can think out—the best we have to the best we know. If you will allow me a definition as broad as that—and I believe in my heart it is one that Jesus Christ approves—then I say there is far more religion in the world than people think. But if you ask if it is easy to get people to go to church, either in our church or in any other church, it is not. This being so, the question is: How shall we address ourselves to the undertaking? At what special point shall we make our attack? Where shall we wisely, as the Lord says, "Sit down and take account whether we be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against us with twenty thousand?" Believers in the organic Church, believers that the Church represents the law of organization, which law, if it be forgotten, failure will certainly follow—believing that men can do God's work best in the world if they join the Christian Church; believing that we cannot do this great work if we ignore this great law which God has made the universal law; and believing that the Church is the embodiment of the law of association in the interests of mankind and for the truth of God; believing this, then I say we should wisely judge and counsel and see how shall we best array the forces which the Christian Church embodies, to attack the evils, to win over the lukewarm, or to bring within our fold that vast mass of religious feeling which half believes it wants us—and wholly fears we do not want it, How shall we use the strength we have got to reach this great mass, whether it be in opposition to us, in ignorance of us, or profoundly doubtful of us.

Now I think when we address ourselves to this question, there cannot be any great difficulty as to the best answer.

Gentlemen, what I want to say I shall summarize in a few words. I want, so help me God, for the years that I have left to me, be they many or few, to do what in me lies to bring the Church of Jesus Christ, as that Church is represented by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, to the poor. That is what I want to do.

There is a great deal of truth in that cry which has found its expression in the last twenty years in many places and through many voices —that cry, "Back to Jesus." The author of "*Ecce Homo*" uttered it. Kingsley uttered it. The great and inspired Robertson, of Brighton, uttered it. Stanley uttered it. A noble band of men past and still

present with us have uttered it. And there is a profound reality, and there is, I believe, a deep and tide-like movement behind it.

We are falling back; we feel we need to get closer to our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. We feel that with Him we are in the presence of the Infinite. We feel that there is profound truth in Christ being over-laid by the theories and sediments left by each retreating wave of opinion, discussion, doctrine, dogma in the Christian Church. We feel that while the effort of man in all ages beyond question has been to get nearer to Jesus, if I may use the illustration, each age, each generation, goes on, gentlemen, making the very mistake that you will remember was made by Peter and John and James when they were on the Mount of Tranfiguration, before they had the full inspiration of Pentecost. They had a glorious time, and the old life rose before them in its reality, and there was the sign of its prophet life in Elijah, and there was the sign of its legal life in Moses, and both bowed in adoration before Him whom they loved to call the Lord. And there was no cloud in their sky, and all the turmoil of life was forgotten. Peter, poor impetuous Peter, with the essential depth of his human soul, uttered the cry which man in all ages has uttered—"Good Lord, let us build three tabernacles, one for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias, and then we will be happy forever. It is a Mount of Transfiguration. Let us dwell upon it. At Thy right hand here is Moses, recalling all the glories of the past history, and at Thy left is Elijah, representing all the prophetic power that has brought us to this point, and both of them worship Thee."

Was there ever anything so natural? "Let us build three tabernacles, one for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias." He didn't know what he said. But the Lord knew better. Beneath the mountain there lay the same humanity struggling in the throes of the devil, and all the powers of the disciples could not cast the foul fiend out; and Jesus—ah, He knew it was time for the transfiguring glory to pass, and time to get the enraptured disciples down out of the glory of the mountain top, down where the multitudes still struggled, and where the Father looked with agony at His Son, where the devil seemed to be winning the day. So Jesus took them down.

Today is not time for tabernacle building. The place of the Church is still at the foot of the mountain, with the multitude crying out for food and for help. There is a wonderful store of truth contained in that narrative. Every age, in love with its ideal, has endeavored to cage that ideal by building round it a tabernacle. It is only to hold, only to perpetuate. It is our fashion. Were the tabernacle to be builded it would become a cage, but Christ is so great that they can no more put Him in a cage than they can put the sun in a box.

The place of the Church is where the multitude throng, and where the devil is to be cast out. Where is your faith? The faith is not in building tabernacles on the mountain but in using the powers of the Christ to transform the places of the world into the similitude of Him who made it and inspires it.

Now there is a great truth there, Mr. President and gentlemen, if we only see it. In this grand old Book we have these indications, old as human institutions are. Just because we cannot help trying to hold our ideals by means of tabernacles, and just because those ideals are

far greater than the tabernacles or cages in which we would hold them, just so every age, in order to fulfil its ideal, has got to pull down the tabernacles of the one that went before it. They have got to be pulled to pieces to make way for bigger ones. And so we pass on under God's great law of spiritual evolution.

Now, gentlemen, it may seem, perhaps to some, rather a far wandering to lead us over subjects like these, when we come to the practical ones to which I am expected to address myself—the practical one of what the Church's opportunity is in the world.

But the reason I dwell on it is because we are all the time forgetful that the Church's hour of opportunity is the Church's hour of growth. You cannot make her grow, you cannot make her strong, you cannot make her take her proper place, by insisting on the idea of the tabernacle, the idea of the building round her of some wall, something that will contain her truth, her doctrine, her life. It is like the silly effort of the poor little child to hold the ocean in its tin cup. It cannot be done. It is a nice play for children, but it does not belong to manhood, and it does not help the world along. And what we have got to do is to recognize fairly and frankly that the men who are going to develop and extend the kingdom of Jesus Christ are the men that with a thousand mistakes still being made by them, constantly faltering in faith and effort, if not in intention, go blundering on, carrying Christ to the world and making the world feel that it cannot do without Christ because Christ cannot do without it.

Now, it seems to me, in the symbol of that hour of transfiguration we have really the parable and picture of what our work has to be. What was that special principle in Jesus Christ's ministry and life which made it imperative on him not to stay in that hour of vision, not to allow the disciples to remain there, but to take them, in spite of their protest, down the mountain and among the doubting, hungering, pitying, devil-driven multitude?

He teaches us Himself, and I take his own word as the best explanation. He says, "I have compassion on the multitude."

Christ was moved by *pity for the multitude.*

Gentlemen, if we had time (and we have not) we might glance for an instant and see how universal was Christ's pity. He had pity for all that fell under all sorts of temptations. He had pity for and He loved the young man who, seduced by the greatness of his own possessions, had not time to follow Jesus. Jesus loved him. He had pity for those perverse and blind leaders who, held in the iron mail of their own tradition, could not see the Christ whose advent they had been preaching. He had pity for all sorts and conditions of men, as His story tells us. But mark you this: He had profound and exceeding pity for the multitude. When we turn to the inspired Book, we find that it was for the multitude His floods of pity flowed.

There were three ways in which that pity manifested itself; and those three ways are three definite and distinct directions to us as to how our pity should extend itself. It is the practical turn I want to give to the subject, and it is in these three practical ways I wish to urge on you tonight what I have to say.

In three ways the pity of Jesus was moved towards the multitude. He pitied their hunger, and He fed them; He pitied their ignorance,

and He taught them; He pitied their leaderlessness, and He led them until He died.

He pitied their hunger, and He fed them. Now, gentlemen, Brooklyn and New York men are practical if they are anything; there is no question about the power of their splendid practicality—God forbid that we should be practical in every department of our life, if not in the mainspring and source of it, our religion. And we want to recognize very fully and frankly that if Jesus Christ came back again on earth, He would be full of pity for the hunger of the poor. I say that if Jesus Christ came back to earth today He would be most certainly surcharged with pity for the hungry poor. And we, as members of the Christian Church, want to face that thing absolutely frankly. I believe I have got to face Jesus Christ. So do you. I believe that absolutely and surely I have got to face Jesus Christ one of these days. "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ." I believe that; and I say, sirs, if I believe that, I am bound to put myself in accord with the mind of Jesus here on earth, and I am bound to look at things as Jesus Christ looked at them. I have no right to make the vows I make in baptism and at the Lord's Table, and, Sunday by Sunday in the creed and in the liturgies of the Church, if I do not make one honest, earnest effort to put my mind in touch with the mind of Jesus Christ. That, I believe, is our first and simple duty to Jesus Christ.

Now, what about this question of Christ, with relation to the poor?

It is not a question that is open to argument. During Christ's ministry, at His time on earth, hunger may have been epidemic; it arose at special times and seasons, owing to the want of transportation facilities such as we have. But it is a simple matter of fact that hunger as a regular institution was not known in the way it is known today. There were great famines that periodically swept certain sections of the world, and at those times almost everybody had to be hungry, and they got over it very soon, in one way or another. But as an institution which shrouded the cradle, and hung its grey shadow over life, from babyhood through manhood on until the grave, I venture to say that hunger was not known in the time of Jesus Christ, and I make a statement which is borne out by those that know.

Now we have got to face that; and the Christian Church has no right to go on repeating her creeds, and joining in her beautiful services, and rejoicing in her sacraments, and at the same time be so alien to the spirit of her Master that she does not think of what her Master would have her do in view of an evil that has grown into an institution.

You may some of you think that this is an exaggeration, but I hold that it is not. It is my privilege to know a number of level-headed doctors on the other side of the river, who have prosecuted their work among the poor for years. I would not speak of experience of my own. There is no difference of opinion about it. I could tell you one doctor's experience. He tells me that in 600 visits made, as physician of the Board of Health, he found 260 babies that were suffering from want of nutrition: 260 out of 600. How would you feel if your baby was suffering from hunger and was thin at six weeks, and puny at six

months, and during its years of boyhood or girlhood lacked sufficient food to give it proper growth, and then went on partially starving throughout life?

Now, I know all that is said about drink. I know something about the drink question, though I never did purpose keeping a saloon. It is my business to know something of these questions; and I am making all the allowances you like for carelessness and drink and indifference in men. I tell you that we are beginning to know today, with a certitude with which our fathers could not know, that the damning influences of environment have an awful lot to do with the after life of man. It is no use condemning people because they are in a certain state. We have to use the knowledge that God has sent into the world, to dig down into those founts of woe, to get back to those dread causes that produce evil, and not simply condemn the evil persons themselves. It is high time that we faced this question frankly and fairly. It is high time that we remember that hunger shrivels up babyhood and girlhood and boyhood and early manhood and womanhood. And not only that, but the contemplation of a life that is pinched by hunger shrivels up what is best in fatherhood and motherhood. People sometimes say, "How hard those people are!" Well, it is fortunate for them that they have a thick skin. If they hadn't a skin like a rhinoceros, they couldn't live at all. But underneath the hard cuticle, there is a warm and true soul. We judge by the outside. We have to judge by this fact, that the Church of Jesus Christ will never do her duty on earth as long as she suffers the environment of the cradle to be a curse to thousands and thousands of her fellow citizens. We have to face this thing, and the sooner we make up our minds to face it the better.

Jesus Christ did not simply deal with hunger. He dealt with ignorance. That is even worse. The ignorance that Jesus met in the Jews had a disastrous result. It scattered the nation; it dragged towards demolition one of the grandest and one of the most beautiful cities that the world has ever seen. It ended in the crucifying of Jesus Himself. The ignorance that Jesus addressed Himself to was awful; but can any man in his senses, recognizing what the twenty centuries have wrought since Christ spoke, recognizing the marvelous social changes that have passed over the world—can any man say that the ignorance of today is not ten times more fruitful of evil than it was then?

Is it sufficient to gather around our favorite pastor, to rejoice in our debts at last paid off? It is an awful mistake. Shall we build a beautiful temple, and adorn it with costly gates, and then go in and worship and let the world float on? Is that what Christianity is going to do? Go across the river and see how the Church is addressing herself to the problem in New York. What have we done in New York? We have given an exhibition to the world of something that, till the end of the Nineteenth Century, the world did not dream of—a sudden growth of wealth that passed man's wildest dreams. That is what we have done. We have put up such a golden god as Nebuchadnezzar, in his maddest dream, never thought of; we have shown the world how quickly we could acquire this power and make this stupendous display.

We do not say we are worse than other people. I am not talking about that. I say we have had a chance to be infinitely better than other people. Ah, if our Lord and Master spoke to us in earthly voice, does any man think He would not come to the Church and say, "I lay sin at thy door?" I believe He would. He would blame us, and blame us righteously, for this awful, awful sin—this sin of ignorance.

What have we done? We have allowed the people to herd and huddle together as they have been huddled in no other city on God's earth; and then, as we got six hundred thousand people jammed together in that little tail of the island, we have run away and left them. We have given them schools, but the worst schools on the island, where life is at the greatest disadvantage. What has been done there? There has been a solid, steady growth of carelessness and ignorance. We have given them primary schools, across the river, and just where all that they had was a school, we have let the school be the worst sort of school on the island.

I could show you a class-room with seventy-five boys and girls in it, running in age from six to fourteen, and speaking three languages, and all under the instruction of one teacher alone.

What is it? Will you think of that state of things? One unfortunate teacher with seventy-five children between the ages of six and fourteen, and speaking three different languages, eight of them speaking English. Can anybody for an instant think that possible if the Church were doing her duty? Oh, if people would only see the needs! Here are these people who can only send their children to school for a few years, whose children must be taken out of school at fourteen or fifteen to supplement the earnings of the parents. The thing we should do for these children is to give them the best possible education in the early years of their life. We do not give them any kindergarten, and we give them the poorest primary school we can, and then we expect to turn them out good American citizens; and if they sometimes come out badly, we say that democratic institutions are a failure. We are failures because we are willing to make our money and say, "I have got a pretty good slice of the gold. It is enough for me and my wife, my son, John, and his wife—us four and no more. Amen. And we have been leaving the children of the city to crowded schools. We have been deserting them with the churches. I am not saying anything about the other churches, but speaking with shame in my own heart to my own people, of the system which the churches have followed for thirty years—a system which is only to be described as social lunacy. It is not so long since I heard a gentleman—one of the most prominent clergymen on our side of the river—try to defend the movement of a great church, of which he was pastor, away up into the prosperous and bright, sunny, rich districts of the Nineties. The church has a big endowment behind it, that is sufficient to pay all its expenses. This man argues in this way; he said: "It is all very well enough for you young men to be storming away at us for leaving Fourteenth Street for the Nineties. What are you going to do about it? In the district we came from there were 3,000 Presbyterians, 8,000 Lutherans, and 15,000 Roman Catholics; there were 25,000 that had no religion at all, and there were 1,800 Episcopalians. Now how in the world did you expect us to stay and minister to 1,800 Episcopalians?

What do you think of that idea of the Church's relation to the people, gentlemen? Do you think it is satisfactory? It is common enough, I assure you. I venture to think that it has little in common with the spirit of Him who said: "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled." And the trouble is that, whether by fault or misfortune, this aspect of the Church has gotten firmly lodged in the hearts of the people; and you go down among the unskilled people of Brooklyn today, whose average wage is ten dollars a week, and 99 out of 100 of these people that are not Roman Catholics will tell you that they believe the Church doesn't want them. I think they are wrong, but they believe that we want the better people; and especially the Episcopalians are sinners in this matter. Gentlemen, these things are so.

Without leaders. Jesus Christ saw the leaderless multitude, and He was moved with compassion for them. He knew what was going to happen. He knew that these people were being led, as He said, by blind leaders of the blind, into the vortex of one of the most awful national calamities that history tells us anything about. He knew it, and when he looked over that throng and when he saw just how they were made up—I suppose, very much as crowds are made up today,—some of them wise and some foolish; some with good intentions and some with none too good; some strong, some weak—Jesus Christ was moved with compassion for them, and He led them till He died.

Just think of that a moment! He led them, though He knew they would soon go back on Him; and any man who is not willing to lead people, though he knows they are going back on him, is not going to accomplish much. The men we want are men who are going to be led by the star of Truth, and not because they think people will fall at their feet; men who will stand firm upon the pedestal of Truth, like Luther, who said, "So help me God, I have got to go the way I am going." What we want is a true, brave voice, and the people will answer to it, when it comes. That was the power of Jesus. He did not make loud professions. He knew people were fickle. He knew how soon they would curse, where now they blessed; but He led them till He died. He could not do anything else.

If I were only an eloquent man, if I could say things that would move people, I would try to move them on that point. There are millions of people in this country that are as these poor misguided Jews were—practically leaderless. We are making that silly mistake, we are beginning to think that we can save the nation by sweeping and garnishing with a little cry of "Republican" or "Democrat" or some other name. Nothing will save the nation but the truth at the heart of the nation. That is what we want to live for and to die for; for that is the only thing worth living for and dying for. And, gentlemen, the heart of the nation is ready for that. I go South, and spend a week in the winter with the cotton planters; in the fall I spend a while with the cattle-men in the far West; I go East in the summer for a few weeks, and even there I hear the men talk. The heart of man was never more ready for intelligent leadership than it is to-day. Wherever you turn you will find men anxious to be led. Look at the University Extension. Look at the men and women to-day in our colleges. Look at Cornell—one of the most wonderful institutions

in the world—a thousand men and women walking together, engaged in all the orderly intercourse of life together—a scandal almost unknown. Gentlemen, it would not be possible in the old world. The magnificent traits of our people amaze me more and more, and these universities are pouring out men fit to lead. The temptation and the tendency is to push the boys into the same mould in which the father was.

If we believe in Jesus Christ, we ought to go down on our knees and say, "Oh, Jesus Christ, Saviour of Mankind, teach me what I ought to make my boys, and not simply make them patterns of myself." Impress it upon your boys that they have to be better than you are, and give the world a larger tribute, for they have received more than you, and they must give to their generation more than you have given. These colleges of ours are filling the land with men and women who are fit to lead. They have the intuition of leadership. If only they felt that they were here not simply to make their own pile, but to labor for God and His Church, this would be the greatest nation the world has ever seen. There are tremendous opportunities in this land, such as the world nowhere else presents:

Too often the children of the church have done little but simply build up their own fortune, and now and then give bronze doors or stained-glass windows, or some other stuff, instead of pouring the spirit of Jesus Christ into the Church's life. Yet, as the old Book says, there never was a time, and there never will be a time when God's spirit will not light on the brows of his people and when from the people leaders will not rise. It is not a question whether there will be leadership. It is a question whether God's children are going to be the leaders. It is a question whether you and I are going to have the honor of doing something in the leading, and in winning that crown for His brow. It is not whether religion is going to win. Of course it is going to win, because God is God, and truth is truth, and right is right. The truth must win. The question is whether you and I are going to be faithful to our trust and do our part in the great achievement. The only thing that will carry on the Church is the life-blood of the Spirit of God in the hearts of men. The question is whether we are to do our part and have our share in the reward, or not.

When I look about, I see that God is raising up leaders. I am going to say something in regard to that in which maybe you won't agree with me. I say that among the lower poor more has been done towards leadership than we had any right to expect would have been done. I want any man to tell me of any class of leaders in this country that are perfect. Will anybody say that the great names to-day that lead in finance are perfect? Oh, no, you won't. We will take the opposite extreme—society.

Will anybody say that the leaders in society are perfect leaders? I won't. In every single department of life—look at political life; will you say that our political leaders are perfect? Scarcely. They are not a bit worse than others. Or in religion—are our leaders perfect? We would hardly say so.

Now, gentlemen, I have one word more to say. There is a class of men in this country, on whom the papers, and sometimes the people outside the papers, pour unlimited abuse; and that is, the labor-leaders.

And I am here to say that I believe the labor-leaders in the United States, taking them all in all, are just as good as the leaders in law or finance or society or politics.

Now let me tell you two things—and I can't give you the man's name, because I would be doing what I have no right to do. I know a man who for years in this country has occupied one of the first positions as a labor-leader. No word is too bad to be said about him by most of the press and some of the colleges; and I know, as a matter of fact, that that man, with a large family of children, never drew but one-half his salary during the whole time he held office, and put the other half back into the treasury of his organization. Now we all know *that* is the usual habit of college presidents and of the clergy. All that I want to point out is that the labor-leader is up to the average. I know a man who, if my judgment amounts to anything, is one of the ablest men in the United States—a man who has great powers of tongue and great powers of organization, and a true, whole-souled man, and although, alas! he is outside the Christian Church, I venture to say, a large whole-souled Christian, too. That man is at the head of an enormous federation in this country, and has never taken but two dollars and fifty cents a day, which is due to him from his trade, and he has never taken even his two dollars and fifty cents a day except when he was engaged in the active business of his federation; and when he has not been engaged in their business he has worked at his trade like anybody else. And I will tell you that this winter, with an old mother to support, that man walked the streets in the cold for three long weeks to get work—(and there is no better workman at his trade), because boss after boss said, "Mr. So and So, you are upholding labor-unionism, and we won't give you work." That man walked for three weeks before he could get a job for two dollars and a half a day, rather than give in and surrender his principles. I say that if our Lord and King were back on the earth, I believe from my soul that those men would be in His train.

Now, the leaders have made mistakes. I don't know anybody who doesn't make mistakes. But take them all around they are doing their best, and we want to help them and to lead them, and to remember that the best cannot do without education in this country. I heard that much-abused man, John Burns, say in Cooper Union, the other night, to laboring men, "We cannot win the cause and secure our rights, except we have the university men and the business men with us, and have them understand our case, and have them know just what we are and where we are. I believe they would be with us, and what we want to do is to get them to be with us."

Do you know, gentlemen, how hard it is, in this country, to get people's attention at all? It is all very well abusing people when they strike, but you know we won't give them our attention until they strike. Look at the cloak-makers' strike last October. A just cause. Nobody paid any attention to them: and if it hadn't been for that noble man, Robert Fulton Cutting, and a few other men, there would not have been a hand outstretched to them.

Now, one thought more, and with this thought I close. I turn again to Christ and his methods. What was his panacea for all evils; with His wonderful power to transform men, which we can only know in

small part—what was His panacea for it all? Oh, men of Brooklyn, remember this: "Pray therefore the Lord of the harvest, and He will send forth laborers into His harvest." He has given no scheme. He does not say, "Send an army." He does not say, "Attack the Jewish government." He does not say, "Declare against the Roman power." He does not say, "Pull down evils." He says, "Send laborers into Thy harvest, Oh, Lord."

And why is that prayer grandly sufficient? Because if only the men will go, the thoughts will come. Because if the men go, the heart will respond. The fire that burned on Pentecost burns on the brow of man still, and the Wisdom on High is still at the command of men, and the power of Jesus still beats, and the love of Jesus still draws; and if men go, then the thoughts come, and the traditions fall away, and old ills are swept back, and old evil places are removed; "the crooked at last is made straight, and the rough places plain, and the wilderness blossoms as the rose; and all flesh shall see it together, for the word of the Lord has spoken it."

This is the cure for the world. "Send out laborers." The only cure is the "harvest-men" of God—men that go because they cannot stay at home; men that go because they cannot sleep until they do go, because of the spirit which burns in their soul; men that go because they are sure that the only thing that lifts a man up in this world, and towards the next, is the service of man, which is the worship of God.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

3 Joy Street, Boston, Boston, Mass., Nov. 1, 1895.

The Executive Committee at its meeting, September 9, 1895, *voted* that clerical members in charge of Parishes be requested to take up, as far as practicable, during their Advent Sunday evening services, social questions from the standpoint of Christianity.

A number of the clergy have already agreed to do this, and the Committee hopes that the suggestion will be very generally accepted, and would be glad to hear from those who can co-operate in this plan.

The Committee urges upon each individual member the importance of doing all that he or she can to extend the membership of the Union and the circulation of its Publications. Any Communicant of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, or of any Church in Communion with it, may become a member by expressing a desire to co-operate in its work and upon payment to the Treasurer of the annual dues. One dollar a year pays the dues and a subscription to the Publications. Non-members may subscribe to the Publications for one dollar a year. Sample copies of the Publications will be sent to any address desired.

The Committee is considering plans for supplying speakers in the different parts of the country for meetings to further the objects of the Union, and will be glad to receive suggestions as to the best way of meeting the difficulties of distance and expense. It is possible that a few such meetings could now be arranged for.

The Committee would also ask all its members, when possible, to try and form local branches, and will be glad to send copies of "What the Church Social Union Is," and a "Plan of Work," or to give any other advice or assistance in its power.

The sub-committee on Prizes has prepared a plan for a prize for an essay to be open for competition among students of Colleges and Theological Schools, and the plan has been approved by the Executive Committee. It seems best to offer a prize large enough to induce thorough work, and the amount has therefore been fixed at $250, but as there is barely enough money on hand to carry out the work already undertaken for the year, this Committee does not feel justified in offering the prize unless special gifts are received for that purpose.

You are asked to give what you can for that object, and also to give for the general expenses anything possible beyond your membership dues, so that the Union may be able to extend its work.

George Hodges, *Secretary*.

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

PRESIDENT.

The Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S. T. D.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

The Rt. Rev. Wm. Lawrence, D. D.
The Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, D. D.
The Rev. Robert A. Holland, S. T. D.
The Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D. D.
Prof. Richard T. Ely, Ph. D.
Mr. George E. McNeill.

SECRETARY.

The Rev. George Hodges, D. D., Diocesan House, Boston, Mass.

TREASURER.

Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, Diocesan House, Boston, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Rev. J. W. Suter, *Chairman.*

Prof. W. J. Ashley, M. A.
Mr. Edmund Billings.
The Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.
The Rev. C. H. Brent.
The Rev. W. L. Bull.
Mr. Francis Watts Lee.
The Rev. Prof. H. S. Nash, D. D.
The Rev. Philo W. Sprague.
The Rev. Floyd W. Tompkins, Jr.
Mr. John W. Wood.

COUNCIL.

The foregoing and
The Rt. Rev. H. M. Thompson, S.T.D.
The Rt. Rev. Davis Sessums, D. D.
The Rev. Arthur Brooks, D. D.
Prof. James H. Dillard.
Miss Helena S. Dudley.
The Rev. W. B. Frisby.
The Rev. Prof. E. P. Gould, D. D.
The Rev. Percy S. Grant.
The Rev. George Hodge.
Mr. James L. Houghteling.
Mr. William P. Johnston, LL. D.
The Rev. A. R. Kieffer.
The Rev. J. S. Lindsay, D. D.
The Rev. Arthur A. Lowndes.
Mr. J. Bleeker Miller.
The Rev. Henry Mottet, D. D.
The Rev. R. Heber Newton, D. D.
The Rev. E. N. Potter, D. D.
Miss Vida D. Scudder.
Mr. Archibald L. Sessions.
The Rev. H. H. Sleeper, Ph. D.
The Rev. Wm. Harman Van Allen.
The Rev. Geo. R. Van De Water, D.D.
Mr. Everett P. Wheeler.
The Rev. John Williams.
Mr. George Zabriskie.

OBJECTS. — 1. To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. 2. To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time. 3. To present Christ in practical life as the living Master and King, the Enemy of wrong and selfishness, the Power of righteousness and love.

MEMBERSHIP is open to all communicants of the Episcopal Church upon application to the Secretary and the payment of one dollar per annum.

PUBLICATIONS. — A semi-monthly series of Publications is issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee, but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

SUBSCRIPTION to the Publications, one dollar per annum. Special rate to members: Annual Dues and Subscription to the Publications both at one time, strictly in advance, one dollar.

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 11. | FEBRUARY 1, 1896. | PER ANNUM, $1.00. SINGLE NUMBER, 10c.

The Spirit and Work

OF THE

Early Christian Socialists

BY

REV. C. H. BRENT.

BOSTON.
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
THE DIOCESAN HOUSE,
1 JOY STREET.
1896.

THE SPIRIT AND WORK

OF THE

EARLY CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS.[1]

Mr. Froude remarks in his *Life and Letters of Erasmus*[2] that historians have hitherto paid too much attention to kings and their doings. This is true not merely in the way he means it, but in a far wider application. If it is not fair to say that there has been a great waste of printer's ink in supplying the world with information about the doings of the few men who, by virtue of position, ability, or good fortune, have been conspicuous in reform and other movements in the interest of human progress, at least it is not to be disputed that far too little notice has been taken of the many humbler lights whose influence has been none the less powerful because unobtrusive and subtle. Some saints and heroes whose names are unknown to men, are of greater magnitude and nobler stature than others, the fame of whom is writ in gold and color on Church Kalendars or the roll call of world-patriots and leaders. At any rate if we are to do full justice to the notable men of history, our duty is to be on our guard against isolating them from their fellows. Oftimes men are great *because* of their disciples; and never are they so *without* them. That which is startling and revolutionary, which gives birth to two evils at the same time that one benefit is born, is as a rule considered to be great. Popular measurements of worth are usually determined by the size and the noise which accompany men and movements. On the other hand the evenly balanced, well-disciplined, mature, far-seeing efforts, whose fruit is small but ripe, are passed by with a minimum of notice.

What has thus far been said is in full degree applicable to a group of men whose principal labors were accomplished in England during the middle of our century. One or two are known somewhat, but then it is chiefly for their least achievements — Maurice for his theology or as some would say his lack of it; Kingsley for his novels and poems; Hughes for his *Tom Brown* stories and his legal ability and distinction;

1. A paper read at the Social Science Club, Denison House, Boston, January 28th, 1896.
2. p. 37.

while the others—Mansfield, Ludlow, Neale are mere names. The key-note of their greatest work is found in the title which they assumed in 1850. They denominated themselves "Christian Socialists" and their organ the *Christian Socialist*. Much as radicals may sneer at and conservatives lament over such a declaration, it remains a fact, on the one hand that these men above all others are worthy of the name "Socialist,"[1] and on the other that to them is due the credit of having initiated one of the most sane, wholesome influences toward social reform that England has seen in this century. Maurice writing in 1866 when the day of struggle was over, says in reference to the name that stirred up so much ill-feeling at the time of its adoption:—"The phrase Christian Socialism, I still think was a desirable defiance of two kinds of popular prejudice, and was worth all the obloquy and ridicule which it incurred."[2] The man to whom students of the British social reform movements of this century for the most part devote their attention is Robert Owen "the founder of English Socialism."[3] And while he merits admiration and gratitude for his unselfish labors, and especially for his success in initiating in England the Co-operative movement, we must not permit him to stand alone. In no strained sense the Christian Socialists are his legitimate successors. They added to Co-operation what he could never have contributed to it—a Christian soul.

The beginning of the Christian Socialist movement dates from the time when the Rev. F. D. Maurice, a Church of England clergyman, took a departure from the ordinary routine duties belonging to the Reader of Lincoln's Inn and the Professor of Divinity in King's College and organized under his personal supervision systematic work among the poor in the neighborhood of Lincoln's Inn.[4] His official position did not entail a parochial charge and what he undertook was wholly voluntary. Among his workers, chiefly law-students, were men of more than average ability and zeal; and but a short time sufficed to bring them face to face with the problems of the day. Their history is the story of a brave, tireless grappling with those problems in the face of serious discouragements and opposition. The world at that time was full of social unrest. The misery which came in hand in hand

1. A name coined in England in connection with Robt. Owen's Association of all Classes of all Nations. See Kirkup's *History of Socialism*, p. 1.
2. *Life of F. D. Maurice*, vol. ii, p. 549.
3. *History of Socialism*, p. 56.
4. "Lincoln's Inn is a very powerful body of cultivated men in the midst of as bad a neighborhood for health and probably education as most in London. If a small body of us could unite to do something for that place our bond would be surely a quasi-sacramental one." *Life of F. D. Maurice*, vol. ii, p. 26.

with the industrial revolution was at its height. That enormous concentration of wealth among the few, which is the conspicuous feature of the civilisation of to-day, had begun, and the laborer was bowed to the very dust with a burden of poverty. The French Revolution of 1848, the teaching of Owen and the continental socialists, added to the knowledge gained in the school of their own bitter experiences, combined to rouse the people to a desperate effort toward social and political freedom. The Chartist movement was the fruit of it all. Mr. Maurice and his lieutenants were fortunate enough to get into touch with some earnest and wise men in the ranks of the laborers. With them they worked and consulted from the first. A series of conferences with working men, not a few of whom were Chartists, was held at the Cranbourne Tavern during the year 1849. These culminated in the establishment of a Co-operative movement. In 1850 the friends organised a Society for Promoting Workingmen's Associations. This was by no means the beginning of Co-operation in England. Moved by the influence of Owen's life and doctrines which had "taught workmen to reason upon their conditions," a handful of striking weavers—known afterwards as the "famous twenty-eight"—were driven to self-help by their misery; they organized in 1844 with a capital of £28 under the name of the Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers, which eventually developed into a concern of great wealth. They now have their manufacturies, warehouses, etc., and the grocery department alone takes in £76,000 a year.[1] But Maurice and his friends ultimately gained no small influence over these very men. The principles adopted at a Congress at Rochdale, 11 years later (in 1855) were those drawn up by Maurice at the outset of the Christian Socialist enterprise. They were: "1. That human society is a body consisting of many members, the real interests of which are identical. 2. That true workmen should be fellow workers. 3. That a principle of justice not of selfishness, must govern our exchanges."[2] The Co-operative movement is to-day on an avowedly Christian basis, thanks to the Christian Socialists.

The effort of the Christian Socialists in the Co-operative movement did not meet with unmixed business success. The societies established with their aid eventually failed and Holyoake contends that they have "hardly drawn a single tooth from the dragon of competition."[3] The poor Rochdale weavers with their subscription of 2d

1. *History of the Rochdale Equitable Pioneers*, p. 2.
2. *History of the R. P.*, p 51; *Economic Review*, vol. i., p. 219.
3. *History of the R. P.*, p. 1.

a week realized their hopes, whereas the Co-operative societies of the Christian Socialists though backed by a large capital went to pieces. This is accounted for by the fact, that "sacrifice and self-reliance are the secret of success in these as in all other enterprises." Those *Associations Ouvrieres* in France that refused state aid in 1848 proved to be the only ones which had staying qualities. Maurice himself writing in 1866 says:—"The more I compared our proceedings in London with those of the men who were working unhelped in Rochdale and elsewhere in the North, the more I was convinced that we should mar the cause grievously and weaken any moral influence which we might possess, by continuing to meddle with the commercial part of the business; that doing little, and that little badly, we should become the victims of clever sharpers like Lechevalier, and should bring disgrace upon a principle which we felt to be sound."[1] The prime aim of the Christian Socialists was to promote the establishment of, not actually to control, Workingmen's Associations. And for the purposes of this paper it will be unnecessary to trace the progress of the enterprise.[2] The Co-operative principle as applied to trade was only one application of the creed of the Christian Socialists. Referring to this very thing Col. Maurice in the memoir of his father's life says:—"First of all there was the pure business side of the question. From time to time this assumed different degrees of importance, and different members took different views about it. From this point of view the main thing was to make the association succeed, and to take such steps as would lead to this result. Secondly, there was what may be called the Christian Socialist view *par excellence*. Those who took this view desired to reconstruct society on the basis of co-operation as a great Christian and true social principle, and to banish out of society everything which opposed itself to these principles. Thirdly, there was my father's point of view. He applied to the case before him precisely the same principles as had guarded him in each successive stage of his manhood. He found it declared as a principle that selfishness was the basis of society and the law of the universe. He eagerly accepted

1. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 549.

2. "At the Manchester Congress of 1853, where he (Maurice) presided at the festival which was held in the evening, his active work in direct connection with the Co operative movement ceased, though his interest in it never flagged, he was always ready with advice or help of any kind when called on. But the tide had now turned and the battle was won, so far as the character of the movement was concerned. It had already, indeed, become highly respectable and acknowledged by 'public opinion' to be Christian, orderly and loyal. Seven or eight bishops, besides Cabinet ministers, noblemen and professors have been Presidents of Congress, and there are always services in the Cathedral or principal church, and some chapel, of the towns where these are held, on the Sunday before the first day. There was no longer need of a confessor or apostle so far as the outside world was concerned and so Maurice gladly turned to work which he felt to be now more peculiarly his own." Judge Hughes in *Economic Review*, vol. i, p. 219.

'co-operation' as a practical protest against that assumption. But in his tract, in his many lectures, in all that he ever uttered on the question of co-operation as well as in the letters to his friends to be given in the course of the memoir, he maintained that all the great work that has been achieved by society *in its existing form* has been achieved by the mutual co-operation of men, and that it has been where selfishness has intruded itself that rottenness and mischief have followed in its train."[1] Maurice, true to this position, protested against and declined to join a Central Board organised under the Council of Promoters, for the purpose of "forming a bond between the individual associations, and serving as a check upon irregularities." The justification of the establishment of the Board was that "the associations were actuated by a thoroughly mercernary, selfish, competitive spirit; that they aimed merely at a more successful rivalship than was possible under the present system; that consequently they would of course produce results much worse than those which the present individual competition was producing unless they were directed by a Central Board which would organise them efficiently and scientifically, or at least set before them an efficient and scientific mode of organising themselves." Maurice's reply was, if he joined the Central Board it was virtually admitting something of this sort:—"My purpose is to turn a number of warring forces, each seeking the other's destruction, into harmony, by certain scientific arrangements of mine concerning production and consumption. . . . . Talk as you like about my system-phobia. It is this which I mean by system, it is this which I have hated in the Church, the State, the family, the heart, and which I see coming out more fearfully every day—the organisation of evil powers for the sake of producing good effects."[2] Here is Maurice's social formula. "*To set trade and commerce right we must find some ground, not for them, but for those who are concerned in them, for men to stand upon.*"[3]

He was shy of organisation under the conviction that unless it were the natural outward expression of some healthy inner impulse, God-ordained, God-given, it would hurt where it was intended to bless. "God's order" he says in the letter already quoted, "seems to me more than ever the antagonist of man's systems; Christian Socialism is in my mind the assertion of God's order. Every attempt, however smal and feeble, to bring it forth I honor and desire to assist. Every

1. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii., pp. 40, 41.
2. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii., pp. 42, 43, 44.
3. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 115.

attempt to hide it under a great system call it Organisation of Labor, Central Board, or what you like I must protest against as hindering the gradual development of what I regard as a Divine purpose, as an attempt to create a new constitution of society, when what we want is that the old constitution should exhibit its true functions and energies."[1]

It is in Maurice's letters that we can best get at the mind of the man. But in the most important of the Christian Socialists' tracts, that entitled *Christian Socialism*, the position maintained both by himself and his fellow-workers is clearly brought out. He was the author of it; it was published in 1850.[2] Speaking about the name by which they and their work were to be known, he said: "'Tracts on Christian Socialism' is it seems to me the only title which will define our object, and it will commit us at once to the conflict we must engage in sooner or later with the unsocial Christians and the unchristian Socialists. It is a great thing not to leave the people to poke out our object and proclaim it with infinite triumph. 'Why you are Socialists in disguise.' 'In disguise; not a bit of it. There it is staring you in the face upon the title page.' 'You want to thrust in ever so much priestcraft under a good revolutionary name.' 'Well did not we warn you of it? Did we not profess that our intended something was quite different from what your Owenish lectures meant?' This is the fair play which English people like, and which will save us from a number of long prefaces, paraphrases, apologetical statements which waste time when one wants to be getting to business."[3] The tract *Christian Socialism* is in the form of a dialogue between Somebody (a person of respectability) and Nobody (the writer). In reading it one must bear in mind that both among those who maintained co-operative or socialist tenets as well as among professing Christians, socialism and Christianity were for the most part assumed to be essentially antagonistic. The dialogue begins by Somebody saying:—"Christian Socialism! I never saw that adjective united to that subtantive before. Do you seriously believe that a Socialist can be a Christian or a Christian a Socialist?" Nobody applies himself to explain the situation. He shews that true socialism,—that of "Owen, Fourier, Louis Blanc, or any other Englishman, Frenchman or German, who has fraternized with them or produced a system of his own," has for its true (though, perhaps unacknowledged) foundation Christianity. Co-operation is the watch-

1. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 44.
2. Reprinted in recent years by the Christian Social Union in England.
3. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 35.

word of(so-called) unchristian as well as of Christian Socialism. Competition is the enemy of both. The unchristian Socialists seeing competition and Christianity apparently "blended together in strange disorder" have identified the one with the other; in their judgment to banish one necessitated the same treatment of the other. Whereas the single force that has conserved society in spite of the disintegrating power of competition, is sound Christianity. Breaking away from Christian thought, Socialists have assumed man to be a creature of circumstance. What is needed then in their judgment is a mechanical contrivance to create and sustain a human brotherhood which in the natural order of things does not exist. But Christian Socialism begins with the premiss that humanity is not an aggregation of warring atoms but is in itself a brotherhood; by the influence of Christianity a higher character is given to this natural fellowship so that it works in a co-operative way. Unchristian Socialism would compel men to fulfill duties based on a new construction of society. Christian Socialism would proclaim what that state of things is which God has made and inspire men to recognise responsibilities and privileges possessed already, though not used, by man as man.

Stronger words than the following about the socialistic character of the Church could not easily be conceived: "The Church I hold is communist in principle; conservative of property and individual rights only by accident; bound to recognize them, but not as its own special work; not as the chief object of human society or existence."[1] It was for the free expression of such thoughts as these that Maurice was reproached on all sides, and for his adherence to them that he was finally dismissed from his professorship in King's College. The sensitive, finely strung nature never shrank from uttering truth because of probable or inevitable penalties. He delivered his message, and shared the common fate of all God's prophets. He was misunderstood, maligned and persecuted.

I have quoted freely from Maurice's writings — chiefly from his letters, preferring by so doing to let him speak for himself rather than to try to summarize his teaching in my own language. It is hardly necessary to spend time in following the course of his history further than to make note of the founding of Working Men's College in 1854, of which he was the first Principal. He believed that "it would always be possible to recruit the teaching portion of the College from the number of

1. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 8.

men who yearly came up to London from the older Universities, who had sufficient knowledge and leisure, and who would gain as much in teaching as their pupils in learning. He had great hopes that in this way if the movement extended to the University towns and the great commercial centres, a connecting bond between the Universities and the mass of the people might be found; that the Church would shew that it could educate the nations; that sectarian difficulties would be overcome; that another motive than the money one would be furnished for national education, viz. the effort of each portion of the nation to turn to account the powers it possessed to supply what others lacked, to the common good of all."[1] This is an idea with which we have long since become familiar in University Extension and similar undertakings. The College on the whole made steady progress, though "all kinds of difficult problems arose which needed no small amount of tact and judgment for their solution."[2] Among the first teachers were such men as Ruskin and Rossetti in the art department; Westlake, F. Harrison, Grant-Duff in history and literature; Maskelyne, Bowell, Huxley and Spottiswoode in science.

Though Maurice spent so much of his life's effort in the interest of the unprivileged, he was in no sense a partisan to any class or classes of men. Indeed it was the sorrow of his heart that there were sections and classes where there ought to be perfect unity. He appealed to his fellows not as members of this or that class but as men. In the first and two succeeding numbers of the short-lived periodical issued in 1848 under the name of *Politics for the People*, he wrote a series of articles on the motto of the new French Republic. He says in the course of his paper on *Fraternity*: — "We profess that we have found the secret of Fraternity long ago. We pretend to think that an Everlasting Father has revealed himself to men in an Elder Brother, one with Him and with us. Who died for all. We may believe this to be true or false. *We* believe it to be true, therefore we can feel to each other as brothers, we can look upon all of you whom we address in this paper, nobles, shopkeepers, laborers, mechanics, beggars, aristocrats, democrats, people of every class and party, as brothers.

The workmen of England should especially consider this point. If a working age of the world is, as some say, beginning, this must be one of its chief differences from that which has preceded it. Men can-

1. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 233.
2. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 304.

not be merely joined together in support of certain plans, or in opposing them. They must learn to act and feel together as men; so they will be able fairly and hopefully to discuss a great number of questions which are of great importance to them. At present members of the working class, like those of the other classes, are often unnaturally bound together, not in the pursuit of great ends, but of certain means which they suppose, on the authority of others must lead to those ends."[1] He has the same thought in mind when in a letter he says "that the reorganizers of society and the conservators of society are at war because they start from the same vicious premises; because they tacitly assume land, goods, money, labor, some objects of possession, to be the basis of society, and therefore wish to begin by changing or maintaining the conditions of that possession; whereas the true radical reform and radical conservation must go much deeper and say: 'Human relations not only *should* lie but *do* lie beneath all these, and when you substitute—upon one pretext or another—property relations for these, you destroy our English life and English constitution, you introduce hopeless anarchy.'"[2]

Next to Maurice, who was undoubtedly the prophet[3] of the Christian Socialist movement, comes Charles Kingsley who stood as interpreter to the former. He was totally dissimilar from his master. Filled with physical and intellectual vigor, he flung himself into the forefront of the battle. By voice and pen and personal influence he made himself felt. His impetuosity and his (at times) poorly balanced utterances created for him many difficulties and enemies. Yet he was the man who was needed for the hour. He was Maurice's Plato. He interpreted his master's not always clearly expressed and somewhat transcendental thought to the many. There was in him, in spite of the aristocratic proclivities bred in his bone, a streak of something approaching coarseness as well as a power to translate the most subtle thought into everyday language which put him *en rapport* with the masses. His infectious enthusiasm bubbles out of all his writings. The subject of his earliest literary effort portrays the trend of his mind. It took shape in the Saint's Tragedy. "To Kingsley the character of 'Dear Elizabeth' has a peculiar fascination." He dwells on how "the young princess, living as a child and maiden in the uncongenial atmosphere of

1. Reprint of the tract in the *Church Reformer*.
2. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 114.
3. "We, the younger men who gathered round Mr. Maurice used among ourselves habitually to call him 'the Prophet,' though we took care that he should not know it, for it would have brought on one of his paroxysms of self-depreciative humility.—J. M. Ludlow in *Economic Review*.

the Thuringian Court as the affianced bride and wife of the young Landgrave Lewis, becomes a rare example of humble piety; how 'in her great pity for the laboring world' she strips herself of gorgeous apparel to clothe the naked, and is reduced to beggary in feeding the hungry: how she empties the royal granaries to save the starving multitudes, and when expelled the castle by court intrigues in the absence of her husband, she, even in the life of privation at Marburg, continues her work of charity. How at last and by order of her relentless father confessor, the last luxury of giving is withdrawn, and under a soul crushing ascetism and severe discipline her feeble frame gives way, and she dies at the age of 24, reverenced as martyred saint by those who in her lifetime, added to the weight of cares by their want of appreciating her single-minded devotedness to duty[1]." He too with Elizabeth of Hungary felt for the people. His expression of sympathy differed from hers, though one emotion swayed them both. From his early boyhood the troubles of the time were burned into his soul. Here is a sample of his thought when a youth of 17, taken from a literary attempt called, *Psyche, a Rhapsody*. "Then she passed on her weary way through ancient cities, where the wealth and the glory of the world were heaped, for a strange desire was on her to seek for love through things above and things below, until she should rest in it forever.

And she wandered on; and from some houses came forth the glare of lamps, and the noise of song and revelry; but with it curses and shouts of strife; and from others the moaning of anguish, and the shrieks of despair. . . . . And she shuddered and turned away.[2]" Five years before this Kingsley had been at Bristol during the riots and what he saw then had left a deep impression on his mind. In later years talking with Mr. John Martineau he referred to this experience, concluding with the words: "That sight made me a radical." "Whose fault was it," asked Mr. Martineau, "that such things can be." "Mine and yours," was his answer.[3]

Like Maurice, Kingsley at once recognized that no mere machinery could give the people their rights. Language used at one of the meetings in the Cranbourne Tavern at first sight seems hardly consonant with this assertion. It was in 1848 when the Chartist movement was at it highest pitch of excitement. Throwing back his head and folding his arms he exclaimed deliberately: "I am a Church of England clergyman," then after a moment's pause, "and a Chartist. My only

1. *Charles Kingsley*, Kaufmann, pp. 60, 61.
2. *Charles Kingsley*, p. 13.
3. *Charles Kingsley, His Letters and Memories*. (abridged edition) p. 159.

quarrel with the Charter is that it does not go far enough into reform." His meaning is best expressed in his own words. "I think you have fallen into just the same mistake as the rich of whom you complain—the very mistake which has been our curse and our nightmare. I mean the mistake of fancying that legislative reform is social reform, or that men's hearts can be changed by an act of Parliament. If anyone will tell me of a country where a charter made the rogues honest, or the idle industrious, I will alter my opinion of the Charter, but not till then. It disappointed me bitterly when I read it. It seemed a harmless cry enough, but a poor, bald, constitution-mongering cry as ever I heard." And again "God will only reform society on the condition of our reforming every man his own self.[1]" In *Alton Locke*[2] he puts his own profound conviction into the mouth of his Chartist hero: "About the supposed omnipotence of the Charter, I have found out my mistake. I believe no more in Morrison's-Pill-remedies, as Thomas Carlyle calls them. Talismans are worthless. The age of spirit-compelling spells, whether of parchment or carbuncle, is past—if indeed, it ever existed. The Charter will no more make men good, than political economy or the observance of the Church Kalendar—a fact which we workingmen, I really believe have, under the pressure of wholesome defeat and God-sent affliction, found out sooner than our more enlightened fellow-idolaters. But at that time, as I have confessed already, we took our betters at their word, and believed in Morrison's Pills. Only, as we looked at the world from among a class of facts somewhat different from theirs, we differed from them proportionably as to our notions of the proper ingredients in the said Pill."

Kingsley wrote two novels with a purpose—*Yeast* published in 1847, and *Alton Locke* published in 1850. A novel "with a purpose" is something like those advertisements by which most of us have been cheated at some time or another, with a fair story as an introduction to a patent medicine. Kingsley, however mixes his ingredients well and the result is not unpalatable. Agrarian socialism is hidden under the story of the former book so successfully that you can see it peeping out of every page. A few verses from "A Rough Rhyme on a Rough Matter" represents its general tone and substance.

> "You have sold the laboring man, squire,
> Body and soul to shame,
> To pay for your seat in the House, squire,
> And to pay for the feed of your game.

1. *Charles Kingsley*, pp. 146, 147.
2. Chap. x.

You made him a poacher yourself, squire,
When you'd give neither work nor meat;
And your barley fed hares, rob the garden
At our starving children's feet:

When packed in one reeking chamber,
Man, maid, mother, and little ones lay;
While the rain pattered in on the rotting bride-bed,
And the walls let in the day:

When we lay in the burning fever
On the mud of the cold clay floor,
Till you parted us all for three months, squire,
At the cursed work-house door.

We quarreled like brutes and who wonders?
What self-respect could we keep,
Worse housed than your hacks and your pointers,
Worse fed than your hogs and your sheep?

Our daughters with base-born babies
Have wandered away in their shame;
If your misses had slept, squire, where they did,
Your misses might do the same.

Can your lady patch hearts that are breaking
With handfuls of coals and rice,
Or by dealing out flannel and sheeting
A little below cost price?"[1]

The book is taken up with a vivid portrayal of the life of misery and privation lived by the tillers of the soil and the laborers in the rural districts of England.

"I think," says the hero on one occasion, "that we gentlemen all run in to the same fallacy. We fancy ourselves the fixed and necessary element in society, to which all others are to accommodate themselves: 'Given the rights of the few rich to find the condition of the many poor.' It seems to me that other postulate is quite as fair: 'Given the rights of the many poor to find the condition of the few rich.'"[2] A remedy of the mechanical order is not suggested by the writer. Anything of this kind in his judgment is at the best merely a palliative. The main value of *Yeast* is just what its name implies. By depicting the shameful conditions prevalent among the people in the agricultural districts a force is set working among those in whose hands the power to remedy lies, which beginning within, will take a healthy outward expression in due time.

In *Alton Locke*, Kingsley follows up the articles, which appeared in the *Morning Chronicle* shortly after the failure of Chartism, on "London Labor and the London Poor." Nothing could have been

1. *Yeast*, chap. xi.
2. *Yeast*, chap. vi.

more timely than these articles and the tract written by Kingsley under the *nom de plume* of 'Parson Lot' entitled, *Cheap Clothes and Nasty*, of which the article on the "Condition of the Working Tailors" is his text.[1] A more trenchant arraignment of the sweating system than is contained in *Alton Locke* could not be formulated. The powerful imaginative genius of Kingsley enabled him to draw his picture with such vivid effect that any who read, can never forget it. He does not hesitate to lay the responsibility of originating the sweating system on the right shoulders, viz. those of the government who introduced the contract method of getting work done for army, navy and the West India slaves; he attacks those who in any way countenance this dreadful abuse; and fearing lest moral argument may fail to reach some of his readers, he shews how for the sake of self-preservation men should avoid having anything to do with 'dishonorable dealers' as the sweaters were called. Here again as in *Yeast* he has no Morrison's Pill wherewith to meet these evils in the industrial world. He advocates the cultivation of the co-operative spirit and its application to trade in associations of workingmen.

While he never lost sight of the need of a new regenerative principle in men if Brotherhood were to be a reality, he seems to have attached more importance to external forces than did his master. In 1851 in answer to some criticisms on *Alton Locke*, he replied: "First. I do not think the cry 'get on' to be anything but a devil's cry. The moral of my book is, that the workingman who tries to get on, to desert his class and rise above it, enters into a lie, and leaves God's path for his own—with consequences. Secondly. I believe that a man might be as a tailor or a costermonger, every inch of him a saint, a scholar and a gentleman, etc. Third. The workmen are tired of idols, ready and yearning for the Church and the Gospel, and such men as your friend may laugh at Julian Harvey, Feargus O'Connor, and the rest of that smoke of the pit. Only we live in a great crisis, and the Lord requires great things of us. The fields are white for the harvest. Fourth. By the neglect of the Church, by her dealing (like the Popish Church and all weak Churches) only with women, children and beggars, the cream and pith of working intellect is almost self-educated, and therefore alas, infidel. Fifth. We are teaching them to become Christians by teaching them gradually that true socialism, true liberty, true brotherhood and true equality (not the carnal dead-level equality of the com-

1. Reprinted in later editions of *Alton Locke*.

munist, but the spiritual equality of the Church idea, which gives every man an equal chance of developing God's gifts, and rewards every man according to his work, without respect of person), is only to be found in loyalty and obedience to Christ."[1]

Kingsley heartily believed to the end in the power of co-operation as applied to trade, "to harmonize the discords of conflicting impulses, and convert the scorching heat of competition into a life-giving warmth."[2] He worked with the Central Board when Maurice felt the unwisdom of the attempt.

When through want of funds the publication known as *Politics for the People* ceased, its place was filled by a new series of papers called *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, which appeared at the same time that the Society for the Promotion of Workingmen's Associations, was inaugurated. Mr. Kingsley wrote the first one, against the sweating system — *Cheap Clothes and Nasty* — the paper to which reference has already been made. It is perhaps the best known of this series with the exception of that by Maurice on *Christian Socialism*. Its value, unlike that of the latter was chiefly temporary, "though it answered its purpose admirably" and "made much noise at the time." After stating the industrial conditions he concludes the tract by suggesting what might be done to make things better. "First this can be done. That no man who calls himself a Christian — no man who calls himself a man — shall ever disgrace himself by dealing at any show-shop or slop-shop." Words that are applicable to our day. "Secondly, let a dozen, or fifty or a hundred journeymen say to one another: 'It is competition that is ruining us, and competition is division, disunion, every man for himself, every man against his brother. The remedy must be in association, co-operation, self-sacrifice for the sake of one another, ... And again let one man or a half a dozen men arise, who believe that the world is not the devil's world at all, but God's: that the multitude of the people is not as the Malthusians aver, the ruin, but as Solomon believed, 'the strength of the rulers;' that men are not meant to be beasts of prey, eating up one another by competition, as in some confined pike pond, where the great pike having despatched the little ones, begin to devour each other, till one overgrown monster is left alone to die of starvation. Let a few men who have money and believe that, arise to

1. *Alton Locke*, Prefatory Memoir, p. xxix.
2. From the *Co-Operative Manual*, quoted by Kaufmann.

play the man. Let them help and foster the growth of association by all means."[1]

Kingsley's plain and vehement speaking brought upon his head the wrath of respectable journals and the enmity of human sharks of all kinds. What he wrote in his books and tracts he no less boldly preached from the pulpit when opportunity was afforded. In 1851 he was invited to preach one of a series of sermons on topics of the day at St. John's Church, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square. He took for his text, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has annointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor, etc.," (Luke iv. 18-21). In the course of the sermon[2] he said:—"I assert that the business for which God sends a Christian priest in a Christian nation is to preach and practice liberty, equality, and brotherhood in the fullest, deepest, widest meaning of these three great words; that in as far as he does, he is a true priest, doing his Lord's work, with his Lord's blessing upon him; that in as far as he does not he is no priest at all, but a traitor to God and man." And again:—"I say those words express the very pith and marrow of a priest's business. I say that they preach liberty, equality, and brotherhood, to the poor and rich for ever and ever."[3] "He pointed out two kinds of liberty—the one to do as one pleases, which is false, the other to exercise moral freedom 'to do what he ought,' which is right; the two kinds of equality—the false which reduces all intellects to a dead level . . . . the true, wherein each man has equal power to educate and use whatever faculties or talents God has given him, be they less or more. This is the divine equality which the Church proclaims." Then he proceeded to distinguish between two brotherhoods:—"the false, where man chooses who shall be his brothers and whom he will treat as such; the true, in which a man believes that all are his brothers, not by the will of the flesh or the will of man, but by the will of God, whose children they all are alike. The Church has three special possessions and treasures: the Bible which proclaims man's freedom; baptism, his equality; the Lord's Supper, his brotherhood."[4] The closing words of his Sermon were:—"There is one man at least in this Church now who has been awakened from the selfish and luxurious dreams of his youth, by that message of the Bible and of the Sacraments, to see the dignity of the people's cause—to feel it at once the most peremptory of duties and the

1. *Cheap Clothes and Nasty*, pp. lxxxiii, and ff.
2. *The Message of the Church to the Laboring Man*, Parker, 1851.
3. p. 6.
4. *Alton Locke*, Prefatory Memoir, p. xxxiii.

most glorious of privileges to proclaim in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, the message of the Church of Christ—That the will of God is, good news to the poor, deliverance to the captives, healing to the broken-hearted, light to the ignorant, liberty to the crushed, and to the degraded masses the acceptable year of the Lord—a share and a stake for them and for their children after them, in the soil, the wealth, the civilization and the government of this English land."[1] Such teaching as this would be considered not merely orthodox but commonplace and trite in almost every Church in the land to-day. But by his words Kingsley drew a protest from the rector who had invited him to preach, publicly pronounced to the congregation who had listened to the sermon with profound interest and sympathy. The excited incumbent declared that "while he agreed with much that had been said by the preacher, it was his painful duty to add that he believed much to be dangerous and untrue." This was followed by an attack in a leading daily paper and an interdict from the Bishop of London forbidding him to preach in his Diocese. The interdict however was soon removed when a copy of the sermon had been read by his Lordship.

Kingsley has been charged by some with having deserted the cause into which he had put so much of the vigor of his younger days. After 1855 he appears less and less among the band of men who had fought for more than a decade shoulder to shoulder. Some attribute this to a yielding to hereditary aristocratic tendencies. But he himself says in a rollicking letter to Hughes in 1856:—"My heart was and is in it, and you will see it will beat yet."[2] Three things perhaps account for his withdrawal. First. "The causes for which he had fought were on the high road to victory: the battle had really rolled away from him to another part of the field." Secondly. The volcanic fires of youth were undergoing a cooling process. Thirdly. In spite of what one might wish to believe to the contrary, that aristocratic tendency, which evinced itself in early days by a dislike to holding intercourse with a man who wore a beard, and by an attack of the blues when he had to meet on a deputation an unfortunate who was clothed as to his hands with blue plush gloves, claimed a certain amount of homage. Doubtless it was with him as it was with Maurice. A pure democracy as we understand it was in the estimation of the latter an invention of the devil. Says Maurice in a letter written in 1852:—"A king given, an aristocracy given, and I can see my way clearly to call upon them to do

1. *The Message of the Church to the Laboring Man*, p. 20.
2. *Alton Locke*, Prefatory Memoir, p. lvi.

the work which God has laid upon them: to repent of their sins, to labor that the whole manhood of the country may have a voice, that every member of Christ's body may be a free man. But reconstruct society upon the democratic basis—treat the sovereign and the aristocracy as not intended to rule and guide the land, as only holding their commissions from us—and I anticipate nothing but a most accursed sacredotal rule or a military despotism, with the great body of the people in either case morally, politically, physically serfs, more than they are at present or ever have been."[1]

Next to Maurice and Kingsley who have been denominated the prophet and his interpreter, comes that group of lawyers who were both brains and arms to the Christian Socialist movement. And of them, he who merits first mention is J. M. Ludlow, one of the few survivors of that band of devoted friends. In the *Atlantic Monthly* of Jan. 1896 there is an admirable paper on the *Christian Social Movement of the Middle of the Century* by this same Mr. Ludlow in which he shews how thoroughly he maintains the principles of his earlier days. Reviewing the French and English Socialism of the century he says:—"When I put all these utterances of mid-century Socialism together I feel far more deeply than I did in 1848 that, with whatever false and even immoral teaching they were mixed, they represented a passionate cry for a uniting Christ. To that cry the churches without one single exception were deaf . . . . . The first clergyman to hear the cry in England was Frederick Denison Maurice." Then referring to his own interest in the awakening movement he continues:—"It would be affectation for me to seek to conceal the share which I may have had in leading Mr. Maurice to the expression of such views. Seven years later, in dedicating to me his volume on *Learning and Working*, he spoke of a letter which he had received from me early in the year 1848, when I had seen Paris immediately after the expulsion of the Orleans family, as having had a very powerful effect" upon his thoughts at the time, and "having given a direction to them ever since." Recalling the agitation in Paris where he was at this crisis he says that the "gagging of public opinion by the Louis-Philippist *regime* having suddenly ceased, the whole city seemed bubbling out into speech. . . . I never saw a priest" he continues, "or a minister of any denomination address the crowd. The conviction was forced upon me that Socialism must be Christianized, but that only a truly social

1. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, p. 129.

Christianity could do the work. Such was the purport of the letter in question." With Mr. Maurice he edited the weekly periodical *Politics for the People.* Later (in 1850) he became editor of the *Christian Socialist* which eventually was changed in 1851 to the *Journal of Association.* His visit to the French Capitol in 1848 when the *Associations Ouvrieres* were in their golden age inspired him to agitate association in England.

From the beginning Mr. Ludlow was a strong friend and wise adviser of the Christian Social movement, sharing with the others its many disappointments and the inevitable obloquy that was the lot of any who where at all prominent.

Of Edward Vansittart Neale a word must be said. He died in 1892. And at the time of his death Professor Brentano of Munich wrote Mr. Ludlow:—"It is with great emotion that I have read in the newspapers that E. V. Neale is dead. He was a unique man, such as only a free country can produce—a hero and a saint. His memory even will be a treasure for England. Of the names of the men who have done most to bring the social evolution in England into a peaceful way, his will stand foremost. His practical life has done more for the reconciliation of the classes and the masses than volumes written by others. Nevertheless it was best for him to die now. I do not think that he would ever have succeeded in bringing the Co-operative movement into the way of unselfish brotherhood, of which he was the living example; and better for him to die with unbroken faith."[1] Neale was drawn into the Christian Social movement at the time of the establishment of the first Working Tailors' Association in 1850. He saw an advertisement of the enterprise in a paper, and by this means was brought into touch with the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations which he at once joined. There was no more earnest advocate of co-operation in England than he. It was he who started the Central Co-operative Agency whose aim was "to counteract the system of adulteration and fraud prevailing in trade, and for supplying to co-operative stores a quality of goods that could be relied upon, and in the highest state of purity." Judge Hughes says of him:[2]—"That Neale had just as real a call to preach association in England as Amos had to prophesy against Jeroboam and the false worship at Bethel, I am and shall always remain convinced." He was originally a man of independent means, but by his lavish and not always wise expenditure

1. *Economic Review*, vol. iii, pp. 38, 39.
2. *Economic Review*, vol. iii, p. 43.

in establishing and subsidizing co-operative efforts he became poor.[1] By his personal influence, his pen, his legal work, he did invaluable service to the cause so dear to him. Like all his compeers his way was far from smooth. Not to mention the loss of a fortune which would be enough to dampen the ardor of most men, he was treated with coldness by some of those who ought to have been his warmest friends. In 1873 when the Co-operative Congress met in Newcastle, Neale then well on in years, undertook the whole secretarial duties of the Union. He did this contrary to the judgment of his friends who feared that because of the failure of his co-operative efforts twenty years before, he would be treated as a mere theorist by those whose servant he made himself by the step. Nor was their foreboding without grounds; he was the object of studied disrespect for many years afterwards. The remark was once made to him, "How can you stand this sort of thing from those boors?" His reply was, "My dear sir, if you want to do any good at this work you must learn to eat dirt."[2]

In an article written by him for the *Economic Review*, the organ of the Oxford Branch of the C. S. U., at the close of his life—indeed the proof sheets were not dry when the news that he had passed away reached his publisher—he registered his undimmed faith in that movement to which he had given the best of himself. Entitled *Thoughts on Social Problems and their Solution*, the paper earnestly advocates co-operation as applied to trade. He enunciates doctrines that could not fail to attract the attention of even secular socialists. For instance:—"The deep root of the disease that preys on civilised society lies, I conceive, in the fact that our civilisation, in multiplying means of subsistence, has taken away from the bulk of the population their natural liberty of using these means. Human activity exercised under the primary conditions of moral Order, on which all material progress depends—the suppression of violence and the strict observance of contract, has produced wealth. The reasons stated above lead me to the conclusion that the permanent welfare of mankind requires the development out of this action of a social state which, without infringing on the right of property in the wealth produced by Liberty and Order, shall confer on this wealth that general accessibility to the use of those, who by this use desire to better their own condition, which men enjoy by the exercise of their natural liberty in dealing with the unapprop-

1. In his later life he again inherited money on the death of a relative.
2. *Economic Review*, vol. iii, p. 180.

riated products of nature."[1] He concludes his paper by pointing out the motive by which his proposed remedy is made effective. "That this force must be a manifestation of that principle of love, which every section of professed Christians admit to be the essence of Christianity, will I think be generally allowed. Personally I believe that the moral strength required to carry it into successful operation will generally be found only among those who profess the Christian name."[2] While years of experience—experience not always encouraging, had not lowered his estimation of the value of association, these same years had deepened his belief that the only hope of putting it into effective operation was an active Christianity.[3]

Only passing mention can be made of Charles Mansfield, Kingsley's intimate friend; of Cuthbert E. Ellison who was "our swell"; of Charles Sully who fought behind the barricades in Paris in '48; of Lloyd Jones, an ardent disciple of Owen and who through the quiet influence of Maurice was led to believe that "Jesus Christ was the Master of the hearts and consciences of men," and last though certainly not least of Judge Hughes who with Mr. Ludlow is, of those who were prominent among the pioneers, the only survivor.[4] His chief delight seems to be picturing in glowing colors what a splendid work everyone else did in "the old days" without crediting himself with anything much to speak of.

Here is a characteristic incident of Mr. Hughes. At a meeting at the Working Men's College to congratulate Maurice on his appointment to the chair of Theology and Moral Philosophy at Cambridge, Hughes said that "he had gradually come to expect that in any matter in which he differed from Maurice even if it was about the way of making a pair of boots, he would be sure afterwards to discover that he had been wrong and Maurice right."[5]

When we leave this interesting group of men and try to tell exactly what was the fruit of their lives, it is at first sight a difficult task. The tangible results of their efforts are few. Among the most impor-

1. *Economic Review*, vol. ii, pp. 525, 526.
2. *Economic Review*, vol. ii, p. 534.
3. "Every Co-operator in the Kingdom now respects his name; he was so modest and unpresuming, so little aware that he had lived a life of self-denial in order to forward a philanthropic object, that the body of Englishmen were scarcely aware of his existence. Few better lives have ever been lived in this world; and his career was the more remarkable because his natural instinct was for the life to which he was born, that of a wealthy Squire, and because he possessed the capacity to have made himself a figure in the country. His defect was over-confidence in human nature; but incessant disappointment neither soured nor daunted him, and he died still believing in Co-operation as the industrial instrument of the future." *Spectator* for Sept. 24, 1892.
4. As this paper is passing through the press news comes that Judge Hughes has entered his rest.
5. *Life of F. D. M.*, vol. ii, 550.

tant, however, are these: First. They added to the fundamental principles of socialism a new motive power in the shape of historic Christianity. And in so doing they demonstrated that the function of the Church toward movements is precisely what it is toward individuals. It must convert them.[1] And conversion always means added strength even though life be less volatile and obtrusive than before; as also it means rigid self-discipline and stern self-limitation.

It has sometimes been a complaint that the Church does not originate great movements. Nor does she for this is not her duty. *Her true function is to enter into and Christianize movements when they have been born. She is the regenerative not the generative power of the world.*

Secondly. They shewed that socialism goes through man's being, —body, mind and soul. Hitherto with a socialism that dealt with body and mind there went an arrogant individualism on the spiritual side. From Saint-Simon to Owen, the Socialists had such unique religious doctrines that no one before or since can be found to have entertained them. If there be any such thing as religion, then that which is nearest the truth must have an organic relation to the religious consciousness of the ages; it must be the utterance of a principle that experience shews to be a common inheritance. The Christian Socialists, who were men of extraordinary frankness and honesty, saw not only that Christianity was not incompatible with socialism in its essential principles but also that there could be no true Christianity that failed to emphasize and apply those principles. *Historic not fantastic Christianity is Social Christianity.*

Thirdly. They belonged to that rank in society which was least touched by the lives and writings of the continental socialists, whose radicalism appealed chiefly to the *bourgeoisie*. By their literature they began to create that uneasiness which is now all the time growing among the privileged classes; which makes them apologize for their privileges and takes oftimes the shape of a practical sympathy with the less-favored. The Christian Socialists set the educated English-speaking world thinking in earnest. *They left behind them that most indestructible of all achievements,—an influence, a spirit.* Because there were such men as Maurice, Kingsley, Ludlow, Neale and the rest

1. Maurice's great wish was "to Christianize Socialism, not to Christian-socialize the universe." *Life of F. D. M*, vol. ii, p. 41. The same thought is expressed by Kingsley:—"The new element is democracy in Church and State. Waiving the question of its (intrinsic) evil and good, we cannot stop it. Let us Christianize it instead." *Letters and Memories of his Life*, vol. i, p. 144.

of them, who were not afraid to speak what they thought 40 years ago, it is possible for all the social work of to-day to be carried on not merely without the opposition, but even with the personal and pecuniary support, of men and women of means. And may it not be further said that through their influence men have been awakened to the the truth that Ordination Vows do not release from civic responsibilities; that when a man becomes a Priest, he does not cease to be a citizen?

Lastly Christian Socialism will always stand as a reminder to us that a system or mechanism, no matter how refined and delicate it may be in its make up, can never be successful for more than a little while and even then superficially; that machinery has no regenerating power: that indirect effort is in the long run more effective than the more speedy but less radical direct effort: that our movements, like our own lives, must be subjected to an unceasing inspection and pruning if they are to be factors in bringing about that social state, which is very far off but for which we all yearn with a widening hope.

PUBLICATIONS.

The following papers have appeared in the Publications of the Union. They may be had from the Secretary at ten cents each. Subscription, one dollar per annum.

SERIES A.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.
Rev. R. A. Holland, S.T.D.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY IN RELATION TO THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH.
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D.

THE INCARNATION A REVELATION OF HUMAN DUTIES.
Rt. Rev. B. F. Westcott, D.D.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
Joseph Mazzini.

WHAT THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION IS.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY FATHERS. (Two views.)
Revs. C. L. Marson and W. F. Cobb.

THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY IN THE CITY TODAY.
Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D.D.

PRESENT ASPECT OF THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington.

SOCIALISM AND SPIRITUAL PROGGRESS.
Miss Vida D. Scudder.

SERIES B.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE OF 1894.
Prof. W. J. Ashley, M.A.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIME.
Prof. Henry C. Adams, Ph.D.

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.
Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND PRACTICAL LIFE.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

STRIKES.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

A PLAN OF WORK.

THE SLUMS OF GREAT CITIES AND THEIR PROBLEMS.
Rev. P. W. Sprague.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.
Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell.

LEGALITY AND PROPRIETY OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

AMERICAN TRADE UNIONS.
Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.

These Publications are issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee; but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

All letters should be addressed and all remittances made payable to

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION,
1 JOY STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Series A. No. 12. | MARCH 1, 1896. | PER ANNUM, $1.00 SINGLE NUMBER, 10C.

THE ECONOMICS

OF

IMPROVED HOUSING

[Reprinted from the *Yale Review*, May, 1896.]

BOSTON.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

THE DIOCESAN HOUSE,

1 JOY STREET.

1896.

THE ECONOMICS OF IMPROVED HOUSING.

A PAPER BY

E. R. L. GOULD.

[From the *Yale Review*, May, 1896.]

THE ECONOMICS OF IMPROVED HOUSING.

THERE is no combination so mellifluous as philanthropy and dividends. Humanity is never averse to simultaneous expansions of heart and pocket. This circumstance affords a useful hint in dealing with many so-called social problems. Social reformers must not ignore economic considerations. They bear positive relations to every ideal scheme, sometimes to dead weight, often to ballast, occasionally to accelerate. The housing question may be classified as social in reference to an end. It belongs equally to economics because the means so largely condition the attainment of the end. Stated briefly, the solution consists in discovering the means of housing the great mass of city dwellers with financial profit, and yet in such a manner that health, morality, sound family life, and social stability may be subserved. The term "city-dwellers" is used because the housing problem belongs essentially to modern metropolitan centres. Smaller municipalities are, generally speaking, free from its conditions and consequences.

The most effective answer to give to the query "Will improved housing pay?" lies in an appeal to experience. It is true that conditions change, and that often a successful experiment could not be duplicated a few years later in the same neighborhood. But it is not at all necessary to choose the same locality, using the term in a restricted sense, for a second effort. Hence any argument based upon local rises in real estate or fluctuations of population fall to the ground. If this kind of combined economic and humanity-regarding enterprise has had a fairly wide field of application, and the trials have proven in most cases successful, then I think we are justified in assuming that what has been done may be reproduced in the present and in the future. Let us then at the outset ask and answer the question "Does improved housing pay?"

Of the 160,000 people in London, who live in real, not sham, model tenement houses, less than 25 per cent. reside in premises owned by philanthropic corporations like the Peabody and Guinness Trusts. The remainder are tenants of individual owners and of companies who expect and receive remunerative commercial returns upon their investments. It is inconceivable how this form of effort should have grown to such proportions in the absence of a profitable income.

But let us take a broader view and at the same time specialize the inquiry. What measure of economic success has attended organized effort to improve the houses of wage-earners in leading cities at home and abroad? Here is a point of vital interest and much depends upon the answer.

In answering this question one must understand that the same rate per cent. can hardly stand for a remunerative investment in different countries. Five or six per cent. might fairly be considered the American standard, five or more probably four, the European. These rates ought to be regarded as maxima, taking into account the security of the investment. Then again four per cent. on model tenements for example is certainly a better return in the long run than six per cent. on ordinary dwelling house property. The former, especially abroad, are strongly built, and even at a smaller annual nominal return yield in the end a more liberal profit.

In the light of these observations the following table, which shows the rates of dividends paid and of net profits earned by commercial and semi-philanthropic enterprises for promoting improved housing in American and European cities of 100,000 inhabitants and upwards, has a special significance. This table covers 34 commercial companies and 16 semi-philanthropic companies, in all 50 out of the 115 about which information is given in my recently published official report. These 50 companies have not been specially selected, they *include every enterprise in their respective classes* in cities coming within the population limit before referred to, viz. 100,000, in eight leading countries. The results should be considered conclusive, since they exemplify the

experience of every prominent corporation engaged in model housing work in these various cities.

A word about the classification of "commercial" and "semi-philanthropic." By "commercial" is meant those institutions which seek to earn as much as they can—those not placing any limits to their profits. "Semi-philanthropic" refers to those companies which, through their by-laws or articles of association, agree to accept a certain rate and not to go beyond it in distributing dividends, disposing of any surplus in the form of rent-bonuses, or reinvesting it when the sum becomes large enough, to perpetuate the work. Therefore, while the semi-philanthropic institutions are of course interesting, chief stress should be laid on those which are purely commercial. Most of those mentioned in the table are commercial in aim, and they take the lead also as regards clientage.

The profits are entered in two columns. In the first appear the dividends declared and paid. But dividends do not often cover all the profits. The reserve laid aside during any year is just as much a part of the net profit as is the dividend. The second column, therefore, refers to the undistributed profit—the sum set aside for reserve, or for any special purpose. Where the size of the undistributed profits was not ascertainable, nothing has been entered in the table. If the figures could be properly presented, the amount would always be larger than the sums entered in the first column. However, the figures as they stand are convincing enough to silence the skeptic and to give calm confidence to well-wishers of the race.

TABLE SHOWING RATES OF DIVIDENDS PAID AND NET PROFITS EARNED BY COMMERCIAL AND SEMI-PHILANTHROPIC ENTERPRISES FOR PROMOTING IMPROVED HOUSING IN AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN CITIES CONTAINING 100,000 INHABITANTS AND UPWARDS.

NAME OF ENTERPRISE.	Kind of Houses.	Per cent. of	
		Dividends Paid.	Net Profit for fiscal year.
COMMERCIAL.			
1. Improved Dwellings Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.,	Tenements.		Older buildings, 10; newer buildings, 5 to 6.
2. Astral Apartments, Brooklyn, N. Y.,	"		2
3. Improved Dwellings Assn., New York, N. Y.,	"	5	6
4. Boston Co-operative Building Co., Boston, Mass.,	"	6	9.96
5. Robt. Treat Paine's Co., Boston, Mass.,	Small houses.	6	
6. Improved Industrial Dwellings Co., London, England,	Tenements.	5	8+
7. Artisans', Laborers' and General Dwellings Co., London, England,	Tenements and Small houses.	5	
8. Metropolitan Assn. for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrious classes, London, England,	Tenements.	4½	
9. East End Dwelling Co., London, England,	"	5	
10. Tenement Dwellings Co.,	Tenements and small houses.	5	
11. Improved Industrial Co., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England,	Tenements.	4(approx.)	
12. Rosemount Assn. for Providing Dwellings for Working People, Edinburgh, Scotland,	"	6	
13. Edinburgh Assn. for Improving the Dwellings of the Poor, Edinburgh, Scotland,	"	3½	
14. Well Court, Model Tenements, Edinburgh, Scotland,	"	3+	
15. Pilrig Model Dwellings, Edinburgh, Scotland,	Small houses.	5	
16. Tenement Dwelling Co., Rouen, France,	Tenements.	2.5	2.6
17. Discount Bank of Paris, Paris, France,	Small houses.	4½ to 6	
18. Havre Workingmen's Dwellings Co., Havre, France,	" "	4	4½
19. "The Cottage," Lyons, France,	" "	5	
20. Rouen, Cheap Dwellings Co., Rouen, France,	" "	3	8+
21. Lille Real Estate Co., Lille, France,	" "	5	
22. Verviers Workmen's Dwelling Co., Verviers, Belgium,	" "	4	
23. Co-operative Building Assn., Dresden, Germany,	Tenements.	4	4.7
24. Berlin Building Assn., Berlin, Germany,	Small houses.	5	

NAME OF ENTERPRISE.	Kind of Houses.	Per cent. of Dividends Paid.	Per cent. of Net Profit for fiscal year.
COMMERCIAL.			
25. German People's Building Co., Berlin, Germany,	Small houses.		5 (approx.)
26. Savings & Building Society, Hanover, Germany,	Tenements.	4	4½
27. Barmen Workmen's Dwelling Co., Barmen, Germany,	Small houses.	4	
28. Amsterdam Assn. for Building Laborers' Dwellings, Amsterdam, Holland,	Tenements.	5	
29. Society for Improving the Condition of the Working Classes, Amsterdam, Holland,	"	5	
30. Workingmen's Building Society, Copenhagen, Denmark,	Small houses.		4
31. St. Erik Building Co., Stockholm, Sweden,	Tenements.	5	6.4
32. Workmen's Building Society, Gothenburg, Sweden,	Small houses.	6¼	
33. Gothenburg Co., for Housing Working People, Gothenburg, Sweden.	" "	5	
SEMI-PHILANTHROPIC.			
1. Tenement House Building Co., New York, N. Y.,	Tenements.	4	4¾
2. Improved Dwellings Assn. Boston, Mass.,	"	4	5¼ to 5½
3. Four Per Cent. Industrial Dwellings Co., London, England,	"	4	6¼
4. Manchester Laborers' Dwellings Co., Manchester, England,	"	None.	None.
5. Glasgow Workmen's Dwellings Co., Glasgow, Scotland,	"	3½	5.33
6. Healthy Dwellings Co., Marseilles, France,	"	3½	3.89
7. Cheap Dwellings Co., Lyons, France,	"	4	4½
8. Workingmen's Dwellings Co., of Passy-Auteuil, Paris, France,	Small houses.	1½ to 2½	2½
9. Brussels Workingmen's Dwellings Co., Brussels, Belgium,	" "	2	
10. Tenement Dwellings Co., Frankfort-on-the-Main, Germany,	Tenements.	3½	4.24 excluding profits on sale of land.
11. Berlin Mutual Building Co., Berlin, Germany,	"	4	
12. St. John's Society, Dresden, Germany,	"	3½	5+
13. Co-operative Building Co., München-Gladbach, Germany,	Small houses.	4½	4⅔
14. Mulhouse Workingmen's Dwellings Co., Mulhouse, Germany,	" "	4	
15. Stockholm Laborers' Dwellings Co., Stockholm, Sweden,	Tenements.	4	
16. Gothenburg Savings Bank, Gothenburg, Sweden,	Small houses.		4

In America, out of the avowedly commercial enterprises engaged in furnishing improved housing facilities, but one paid less than 5 per cent.; 9.96 and 10 per cent. represent the maximum of net profits in two specific instances. The reason alleged for being temporarily unable to earn more than 2 per cent. in the single exceptional case was a certain prejudice against the appearance of the building, which working men thought looked too much like a barrack or public institution. This notion bids fair to pass away, since families who came to live there show a tendency to remain.

Of the two American semi-philanthropic housing corporations mentioned, both earned up to the fixed limit, viz. 4 per cent. and in addition from ¾ to 1½ per cent. for reserve.

In Europe but 3 out of the 29 commercial housing enterprises failed to earn at least 4 per cent., while 19 earned 5 per cent. and upwards. One of the three delinquent corporations was too lavish in construction and so was handicapped; the second, which paid 3½ per cent., caters exclusively to the very poor. There is no satisfactory explanation for the third. Amongst the fourteen semi-philanthropic organizations in European cities about which facts are recorded, two may be set down as having failed to pay as well as they should. There are adequate reasons in one of these instances. Ten of the fourteen companies earned 4 per cent. and upwards. The significance of these facts is more easily grasped when stated percentually. The successful enterprises constitute 88 per cent. Six per cent. earned a savings bank rate of interest, while the remaining six per cent. failed to do so well.

It is noteworthy that this success has been achieved under favorable sanitary conditions. Almost uniformly there has been the most ample provision for light and ventilation, a provision far in excess of legal requirements. Thus as a rule only from 50 to 65 per cent. of the plots of ground has been covered with buildings. The construction has always been durable, while rents as a general thing are slightly lower than for fairly simple accommodations in the neighborhood.

By going a little more fully into details and selecting representative block buildings belonging to some of the best known

housing corporations, results of equal significance can be shown. Such an analysis is more convincing when not carried beyond our own country, because any amelioration which may be attempted in American cities must necessarily face American, not European conditions.

The following table refers to five well-known enterprises in Brooklyn, New York and Boston. The figures relate to specific buildings, a better basis of comparison for prospective operators than the general experience of a company. The object of the comparison is to afford a knowledge of what is a safe limit of expenditure in order to produce definite economic results.

Name of Tenement Building.	Original cost of land per sq. ft.	Total cost of land, buildings, &c. per room.	Average rental per room per week.	Rate of net profit on this particular tenement building.
Riverside Buildings, Brooklyn, N. Y.,	$1.36	$455.00	$0.85	5 to 6%
Block Building, First Ave. and Seventy-first St., New York, N. Y.,	1.12½	431.00	0.80	6%
Cherry Street Tenements, New York,	2.57	568.00	0.85	4¾%
Harrison Avenue Estate, Boston, Mass.,	0.60	436.00	0.98	5.9%
Rufus Ellis Memorial Bldgs., Boston, Mass.,	1.00	475.00	0.80	5%

These are the principal enterprises in American cities where the needs are greatest. Every one of them show good, one may say excellent, financial results.

The Peabody Trust in London houses 20,000 people. Three per cent. is earned on property which cost $533 per room, and where the average rental is only 52 cents per room per week. The Guinness Trust sets aside the same rate per cent. on a weekly rental of 45 cents per room. The average rental for the Improved Industrial Dwellings Co., of which Sir Sidney Waterlow is president, is under 60 cents per room per week, but owing to exceptional concessions on land leased from some of London's titled landlords, 8 per cent. net profit is made.

In continental cities wages and rents are lower than in England and the United States, yet there also model housing is remunerative, as the first table makes plain.

The analysis of economic experience here presented shows conclusively that five per cent. in dividends and a safe reserve can be earned on model tenement dwellings anywhere, charging customary rents, provided the total cost of the completed property does not exceed $500 per room. Is there not still in all cities a chance for operations within this limit?

Mr. Clement Dunscombe, formerly city engineer of Liverpool and a veteran expert in housing reform, has prepared an ingenious table showing the rates of profits which may be earned at certain rentals, and average cost of land and construction, per room. I have tested his figures by applying them in several concrete cases and have found them fairly to accord with actual experience. One must simply be a little more liberal in calculating for American cities. According to his calculations, a tenement property which cost, ready for occupancy, $490 per room, and where rentals averaged 80 cents per room per week, would yield 6 per cent. net profit to the owners, after deducting 30 per cent. from the gross rental for repairs, taxes, insurance, superintendence, minor expenses and empty apartments.

MAXIMUM OUTLAY PER ROOM THAT AT A GIVEN RENT WILL YIELD A GIVEN RATE PER CENT. PER ANNUM.

(In all cases 30% has been deducted from the gross rental for taxes, repairs, unoccupied dwellings, etc., to arrive at the net rent upon which the percentage has been calculated.)

Gross Rent per Room per Week.	Maximum Outlay per Room that will yield each year—														
	6½ %	6¼ %	6 %	5¾ %	5½ %	5¼ %	5 %	4¾ %	4½ %	4¼ %	4 %	3¾ %	½ %	3¼ %	3 %
25 Cents	$140	$145	$150	$155	$165	$170	$180	$190	$200	$215	$225	$240	$260	$280	$300
31 "	175	180	185	195	205	215	225	235	250	265	280	300	325	350	375
37 "	210	215	225	235	245	255	270	285	300	320	340	360	390	420	450
43 "	245	255	265	275	285	300	315	335	350	370	395	420	455	485	530
50 "	280	290	300	315	330	345	360	380	400	425	455	475	520	560	605

What are some of the conditions essential to success in improved housing?

In the first place good judgment must be exercised in the selection of localities. Land must be acquired at a moderate price. Five dollars per square foot is probably an outside limit, and this sum can only be paid where a good-sized plot is built over. It is essential to get land much cheaper if possible.

Convenience of access is another important consideration. This is not quite so difficult to attain as formerly, owing to rapid transit facilities. Distance is now rather a measure of time than of space. Rapid transit not only extends the area of accessibility, but it helps us to neutralize the effects of rising land values. Its future significance in the matter of house amelioration is very great. We are just entering upon the electric age and the appliances now in use probably only afford a hint of what we may expect. The simple trolley is scarcely the acme of achievement, yet already it is a factor of the highest value in improving living environment. With real rapid transit in New York, either the proposed underground electric system running its express trains from the Harlem River to the City Hall in fifteen minutes, a surface railroad skirting the docks of the East and North Rivers, crossing the island along 14th St., or the utilization of the existing elevated railroads by making a Brooklyn terminal in New York and a terminal for the Manhattan elevated system in Brooklyn, a marvelous emptying of congested districts may easily be attained.

The growth of rapid transit invites special attention to the cheapening of fares. Massachusetts is the only State in this country whose railroads are obliged to run workingmen's trains. In England such means of conveyance are common, and a man may make a daily trip of ten miles, and even further, for four cents. Where street railways are the property of municipalities, suitable facilities for the transportation of workingmen may be readily stipulated. In Toronto all the street railways are operated by electric power. They became the property of the city in consequence of an agreement made over thirty years ago. When possession was

obtained, the franchise was leased to a private company on fixed terms, and one of these stipulations was that between the hours of six and eight in the morning and half past five and seven in the evening, any person may be transported, on presentation of fare tickets, which are sold at the rate of eight for twenty-five cents. School children pay a uniform rate of two and one-half cents.

Land is necessarily dearer the nearer it is situated to business centers. Such spots are usually the favorite residences of poor laborers, casuals, and the dissolute element. If modern tenements are to be built there and made to pay, building cost must be reduced by making the structure plain and giving to tenants only the most necessary conveniences. It is never advisable to make this class of building too attractive, for with moderate rentals, unless great care is taken, parsimonious members amongst the better-off elements of wage-earners will be sure to become tenants and thus monopolize advantages intended for the very poor. Again, too many accessories and conveniences for a class of people not accustomed to them and not very careful of them, involve not only an unnecessary original outlay but also a very large repair account.

Building cost is also important from another point of view. During late years, higher wages, shorter hours and enhanced prices of certain kinds of material, notably lumber, have operated to make building more expensive than formerly. A gentleman who is the owner of large blocks of excellent tenement property showed the writer from his books that the difference between the building cost on two practically similar properties, the one built seventeen and the other six years ago, was almost 50 per cent. Undoubtedly this comparison is not representative of present conditions, because the general depression of the past two or three years has made the present moment favorable. But whatever element helps to enhance building cost, it is important that structures should be solidly put together, making up in durability what they lack in cheapness.

Again there must be an understanding as regards the particular class to be catered to by each individual enterprise

and buildings erected to suit each class. A knowledge of current earnings of residents of the neighborhood must be acquired and rentals fixed which they can afford to pay. Neglect of this preliminary will entail disaster. Rentals should not be in advance of prevailing prices in the neighborhood, for it is a peculiar characteristic of working people, particularly the lower strata, that they are apt to economize most in rent. This is perhaps a necessary corollary to their lack of appreciation of the hygienic and economic value of wholesome home surroundings, something we need not greatly wonder at.

Another essential in a successful housing enterprise is careful and tactful superintendence. Management is the deciding factor in all business enterprises. The word "tactful" refers to devices to secure prompt payment of rent and care of property, for example, a week's rebate twice a year, at midsummer and Christmas, when the concession would be most appreciated. Companies renting property to a very low class of working people—people of slovenly habits, not careful in their use of the buildings, and usually irregular in their payment of rent,—by this little bait, lead the tenants in time to improve their habits and take good care of the property. Such measures are advantageous to proprietors, and are helpful because educative to tenants. The expedient is particularly valuable to the lower classes.

If all these conditions have been observed, and it is found that, with prevailing rentals, a desired financial return is possible, the project may be considered feasible. Where any of the important elements are lacking, another locality should be chosen. Purely speculative anticipations and blind trust in Providence will not avail to bring economic success in the face of lack of understanding of environing conditions or direct violations of sound business principles.

Improved housing will not pay unless effort is suited to the needs of each particular class. We must, therefore, differentiate the conglomerate mass of wage-earners, or the poor, as they are sometimes called, into fairly homogeneous subdivisions. Here is the keynote to success in dealing with the housing problem. The first category includes skilled

laborers, or as they are usually called in England, artisans. These people earn fair and steady wages. As a rule they are sober, thrifty, and socially ambitious. They make good tenants, and they usually have little difficulty in renting suitable accommodations. All the help they need is that which should be available to every citizen, viz: thorough, stringent, and well-enforced sanitary and building laws.

If large sections of this class reside in localities where tenement houses are the rule, improved housing companies may enter into the business of furnishing model accommodation, with little danger of failure.

But special efforts should, I think, be made to render this section of society a proprietary class. The work cannot easily be done within existing ordinary residential limits, in New York, at least, but the opportune moment will come with better transit facilities. What is most needed is proper financial combinations to render suburban districts available for the purpose in hand. To organize such agencies is a work of the highest utility, because nothing contributes to the well-being of the working classes or to social stability like the facilitation of proprietorship of homes. Neither should the ethical outcome of such work pass unnoticed. Home in a tenement building can never be what it is where a single roof covers an individual family.

Co-operative building and loan associations have hitherto been chiefly relied upon in the United States, in Great Britain and in Scandinavian countries to extend proprietorship of homes amongst artisans and low salaried clerks and officials. Two years ago there were 5,838 of such institutions in this country, representing more than 1,745,000 shareholders, and having net assets of $451,000,000, including profits of $81,000,000. The 3,000 English societies possess an undistributed surplus of about $10,000,000, and have been instrumental in furnishing nearly 400,000 homes.

Co-operative building and loan associations have rendered most valuable individual and social service, but like all other forms of pioneer effort, they may be improved. They present three leading drawbacks.

1. Expense to borrowers is greater than is absolutely necessary. Enhanced profits to the lender,—and he usually gets them,—come from the pockets of acquiring proprietors who are borrowers.

2. Business skill of a high order is not readily available for management, involving occasional losses or failures.

3. In case of the death of a borrower before his term payments have been completed, his family is often obliged to surrender the home under disadvantageous circumstances.

The cheapest, fairest and most effective scheme for facilitating the proprietorship of homes amongst working people in existence at the present time, was originated in Belgium in 1889. It has had seven years' trial, and is steadily growing in favor. More than sixty companies are now in operation. Other countries, notably France and Germany, are seeking to apply the same system. This measure is not socialistic, although the loan capital comes from the general savings bank whose deposits the government guarantees, and which is, therefore, in a sense an official institution. The loans are not made directly to working people, but to intermediate agencies which are responsible to the bank. There are four classes of corporations, namely, joint stock and co-operative loan companies, and joint stock and co-operative building companies. The difference between the loan and the building company is that in the former case the corporations make loans to individuals who select their own property, whereas the latter buy tracts of land, build houses and sell them to acquiring purchasers. The loan company represents the prevailing type of enterprise. An idea of the working of this law can best be gleaned by a concrete example, and in the following statement a joint stock loan company has been selected as the working agency.

A number of gentlemen of wealth and standing come together in a community and form a joint stock loan company for the purpose of facilitating proprietorship of homes for workingmen. Let us say that there are ten, and suppose that they subscribe $10,000 apiece, making a capital stock of $100,000. Ten per cent. of this sum is paid up; the remainder is not called. Upon the security afforded by this

uncalled capital stock, to the payment of which the credit of subscribers is pledged, a loan is secured from the savings bank to the amount of $45,000, that is 50 per cent. of the unpaid capital. A fund of $55,000 is now available. Workingmen are made aware of the opportunities offered and such of them as desire homes put themselves in communication with the company. The latter requires that a wage-earner must be able to pay down a sum equal to 10 per cent. of the entire value of the property he wishes to build or purchase as a precedent to the company loaning him anything. Let us suppose that a workingman desired a property for which he was willing to pay $2,000. He would be required either to deposit $200 at the outset or to purchase a lot of the value of $200 upon which his house would be built. The loan company would then advance to him out of this fund of $55,000 already spoken of $600, or one-third of the sum which represents the unpaid value of the property. The company offers the workingman the choice of plans of houses which it has secured from architects who have made careful studies of the living requirements of wage-earners. Every effort is made to give a maximum of value, hygienic and economic, at a minimum price. Building now proceeds, and when the loan already made has been spent and some tangible value created, the savings bank loans to the company, for the workingman, upon a first mortgage on the house and lot, the remaining $1,200, a sum equal to three-fifths of the value of the property. When the house is built, the wage-earner, in entering upon its occupancy, chooses a period of time in which to repay his obligations. In order to carry out the purposes of this act an insurance bureau has been created in connection with the general savings bank. This bureau has distinct accounts and insures the life of the borrower so as to guarantee the reimbursement of the loan to the bank in case of the death of the party insured at any time during the period of liquidation. The workingman, therefore, insures his life for the term of years over which he desires to spread the installments. For example—ten, fifteen, twenty or twenty-five years. To the premiums which represent 3 per cent. per annum, with Farr's life tables as the accepted basis of

calculation, and 3 per cent. for expenses, is added the annual interest upon the sum due and payable at 4 per cent. per annum. This sum is divided into equal parts representing monthly payments and they are all that are made. If he live out the period he will receive his house, for which he has paid simply the life insurance premium plus 4 per cent. interest on the deferred installments. If he die, his family enters at once upon the possession of the home. In other words, this man has insured himself simply for a house instead of for the usual paid up policy or cash commutation at the end of an endowment period. Where death occurs and the home is handed over to the heirs of the deceased, the policy is simply cancelled and the transaction thereby ended. Should the necessities of the wage-earner require a change of residence during the time when he is paying for his home, his policy always has an equitably computed cash surrender value. Should he default for any cause whatever, he may within five months demand a resuscitation of his policy upon the payment of the accrued premium increased by 3 per cent. interest. He is obliged, however, to undergo medical re-examination. As a matter of fact where three or four years' payments have been made before the workingman gets into difficulties, any individual or institution is perfectly safe in taking over his obligations and making his payments for him.

A workingman as old as fifty-five years may begin the purchase of a home in Belgium on this insurance plan. Of course the earlier in life he commences the lower the cost to himself. The law was intended to benefit workingmen solely, hence the limit to the value of a property, including both house and land is 5,500 francs (about $1,100).

The following features of this plan need special emphasis.

1. A loan company operating in the manner described with a capital stock of $100,000, can make ninety-two workingmen proprietors of homes worth $2,000 apiece for each turn over of the funds subscribed and borrowed. The paid up capital is very small indeed, namely, one-tenth. Such is the machinery of this law that it is possible for ten men of public spirit actually putting up $1,000 apiece upon which they receive interest at a savings bank rate, but also pledg-

ing their credit to the extent of $9,000 each, to keep on doing this work indefinitely.

2. Co-operation between the capitalistic and labor interests of the community is secured on a plan not only honorable, but mutually satisfactory in an economic sense. In other words, all this is done at a fair cost to the workman and a reasonable profit to the capitalist.

3. The life insurance feature offers a needed protection to the family of the wage-earner which finds itself deprived of its head during the course of the acquisition of a home. It is a kind of life insurance which presents some concrete advantages to the ordinary mind. Where one insures for a cash endowment, the enjoyment of one's money is deferred until the payments cease. Not so where the endowment is a house. One gets that at the beginning and enjoys the privilege of living in it rent free while the installment premiums are being paid. This is an advantage which forcibly appeals to any intelligent workingman, or any other kind of intelligent man for that matter. The problem is simply a question of cost. The risk of this business is very small, from the fact that one is dealing with persons between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-five, where the death rate is always low. Experience shows that the cost of acquiring a house on this plan, if one chooses fifteen years or more as the period of repayment, is in Belgium less than the ordinary rental for the same class of property. Let us present concrete figures, for they are much more interesting than a general statement.

If a young man commences at the age of twenty-one to acquire a home on this plan, and if he choose ten years in which to repay his loan, the entire cost to him will be $10.99 per month.

Fifteen years	$8.24 per month
Twenty years	6.90 " "

A person at the age of thirty-five on a ten year period would be called upon to pay $11.12 per month

Fifteen years	8.41 " "
Twenty years	7.11 " "
Twenty-five years	6.38 " "

If a man delays till forty-five years before he commences to provide a home he will pay—

During a ten year period.....	$11.35	per month
Fifteen years.....	8.69	" "
Twenty years.....	7.46	" "

The adaptation of this plan to American conditions ought not to present any serious difficulty. Approved by experience, there can be no possible question of its practicability; the only problem is to secure the financial support necessary to render it operative. The social application of the principle of insurance to the acquisition of homes is a work of such vast utility, that the discovery of its feasibility ought to stimulate all who are willing to offer their energies or their means to its effective accomplishment.

The advantage of insurance over the installment plan of repayment is that it encourages wage-earners to begin saving early in life. The insurance premium is then smaller, risk of death is less, and so the home is acquired for a comparatively small sum. Talk to a young man about life insurance and he will tell you he sympathizes with the Irishman who insisted that it was rather undesirable to provide for a second husband. There is at all events something intangible about life insurance, but when one speaks of an endowment which brings a home, especially as occupancy of the home may be enjoyed in the meantime, the advantage is clearly seen.

In Belgium the difference between the plan of re-payment for the house with life insurance and on the plain installment plan is very slight indeed. A man twenty-one years of age when he purchases a home would pay but seventeen cents a week more with insurance than without. At forty years of age only twenty-one cents more weekly. Where longer periods of repayment are chosen the difference is less. Long periods are preferable to short ones because the installment becomes less than ordinary rental, while life insurance protection lasts longer. Such a consideration has no mean value to young men, clerks, etc., who do not earn much early in life. It may not affect manual workers to the same degree, though anything which reduces an installment payment with life insurance below the ordinary rental charge is a good

thing. A larger constituency is thereby appealed to and helped.

The Belgian plan is susceptible of being modified to suit American conditions. It is true that capital can hardly be had at as low a rate of interest, but this is only one element in the scheme. It would be perfectly feasible for a building company to develop a suburban estate, securing loans from savings banks, trust or insurance companies, to at least 50 per cent. of the value of the completed property, on first mortgage. The wage-earning purchaser should be expected to pay down 10 per cent. Forty per cent. would thus be left to the building company with second mortgage as security. The building company might arrange with an insurance association to take the risks on the lives of purchasers on the reducing renewable premium plan, which would provide for insurance to cover the unpaid installments simply. The company would secure the policies and pay the premiums, so that the worker would have nothing to look after. This is a plan which is followed to some extent by a few building and loan associations. The only difficulty is that they charge liberally for the insurance, so that the rate to the acquiring purchaser is not brought low enough.

An ideal arrangement is that which permits the same company to loan money and insure lives. In case of its failure for any cause the patrons cannot be affected, as would be the case in a possible failure of a life insurance corporation or of a loan corporation singly.

There is absolutely no difficulty about getting money for the conduct of such enterprises, as it is a perfectly safe business. The only thing necessary is a little ingenuity and a fixed purpose on the part of promoters to receive a moderate profit from their undertaking. The scheme itself bears some resemblance to annuity plans, except that the process is exactly the opposite. Instead of paying a lump sum before getting an annuity, one gets the annuity and then pays for it gradually.

The next step in this gradation is occupied by individuals who have not mounted quite so high in the social scale. They are inclined to be lazy and careless, are not particulary intelli-

gent or ambitious and are by no means perfect from the standpoint of *morale.* Coupled with them for the present purpose may be enumerated those who, through sickness or some other misfortune, have grown deeply in debt or become discouraged in the unequal struggle to maintain a fair standard of existence. Both sections of this class are irregular rent-payers. Persons belonging to the first are not desirable as tenants from any point of view. Their earnings will not permit them to pay high rents, and they have usually difficulty to find fair homes, especially if they have large families. Now this is a class placed on an inclined plane so to speak, their characters and circumstances pushing them downwards while their living environment adds stimulus in the same direction. They need looking after. The rent-collecting and friendly-visiting methods of Miss Octavia Hill are peculiarly applicable in their case. Their existence also offers an opportunity to semi-philanthropic corporations to build model tenements.

It should clearly be the purpose of philanthropic and semi-philanthropic housing agencies to look after such people, but few of them really restrict their tenantry to the most needy cases. The average earnings of the clients of the Peabody Trust, for example, are far above the stipends of this class. The Guinness Trust is really reaching down to the masses, the average earnings of the entire family being for all tenants about $4.80 a week.

There is a possibility of helping this class of people in a substantial way without appealing to philanthropy. The purchase of old property, its renovation and subsequent adminstration by a lady rent-collector represents the method referred to. The Glasgow Workmen's Dwellings Co. has engaged in such operations to a considerable extent and with excellent financial results. Six per cent. net has been earned upon renovated property, whereas but 3½ to 4 per cent. has been made upon model tenements belonging to the association. Increased stringency in sanitary administration reduces the value of bad property. The proprietor as a rule prefers to get rid of it to being continually nagged into making repairs whose final outcome is extremely problematical. An oppor-

tunity is thus afforded to acquire cheaply this class of property, fix it up and rent it at such rate as will tempt the poorer classes to become tenants.

Not only in Glasgow but in American cities this sort of experiment has been successfully tried. A recent experience in New York is typical. Not long ago a five-story brick tenement on a lot 25 x 100 was purchased by a syndicate of church members from one of the more active Episcopal churches. The house was in very bad repair, dirty and only half-tenanted. The cost, which was $15,000, was divided as follows:—$8,000 on first mortgage at 4½ per cent. and $7,000 on second mortgage assumed by the syndicate at 5 per cent. About $150 was expended in putting the building into a fairly tenantable condition, including slight repairs, a thorough cleaning and some painting. Not less than five wagon loads of refuse were taken from the cellar alone. The house was almost immediately fully rented and is fully rented to-day. The rentals amount to $132 per month. The annual expenses are as follows:—

Interest on $8,000 at 4½%	$360.00
" " $7,000 at 5%	350.00
Taxes	131.79
Insurance, gas, water and incidentals	150.00
Commission	75.00
Total	$1,061.79

Or about $90 per month. There is thus a balance of about $42 a month. There is no difficulty whatever in renting the apartments. This $42 is now being expended monthly for the improvement of the building. When this has been completely executed, the profits will be applied to a sinking fund to liquidate the mortgages.

Many properties now bought in to satisfy first mortgages could very easily be re-purchased on advantageous terms, put in order and be made to pay the handsome profit indicated in the preceding statement.

Splendid sociological achievements have attended the rent-collecting system orignated by Miss Octavia Hill of London. This plan represents the friendly visitor with wise head and sympathetic heart in the homes of the poor. Miss Hill,

moved to pity and indignation by the doleful situation in which she found some of her poorer neighbors, once unburdened her mind to John Ruskin. She said jokingly in reference to a given property, "I wish you would buy it, put it in fair order, and let me collect the rents for you." The sympathetic poet, art critic, and political economist, quickly responded, "I will," and he did. Miss Hill's experience in her initial effort was so satisfactory that she has since made friendly visitation of working people her life-work. Her example has stimulated a multitude of followers, and thousands upon thousands of homes have profited in a most practical way.

Miss Hill becomes the agent of proprietors for collecting rents on non-paying property. As a rule such houses are occupied by the very poor, who are often shiftless, ignorant and dirty. Migration is their habit. Rent-jumping to some of them is an art, and old tumble-down rookeries their favorite shelters. Miss Hill stipulates with the proprietor before taking charge of the property that the rooms and sanitary conveniences shall be put in good order. She further requests that after the usual commission for collecting and 5 per cent. upon the real value of the property is provided for, the remaining sum shall be expended upon repairs and improvements. In her economic relations with tenants Miss Hill is inexorable, requiring promptness and completeness in the payment of rent, but in her ministries of counsel as a moral helper she is a sympathetic and faithful friend.

It has always seemed to me that rent-collecting on this plan might well commend itself to more general practice. Churches and college settlements, for example, offer exceptional facilities for such work, and a small revenue might be derived from it. In its conduct, however, sound judgment and business tact are much more essential than sympathy and enthusiasm.

It has sometimes been objected that rent-collecting could not be carried on in this country because Americans resent outside regulation of their habits more than do Europeans. The objection has little, if any, force, especially when we con-

sider that the lower classes of large American cities, to whom such work would be applicable, are not mainly Americans but Europeans. An analysis of the population of New York City for example shows that only 20 per cent. of the entire population, including colored, are native born of the second generation. The remaining 80 per cent. are pretty nearly equally divided between the foreign born and the native born of foreign parentage, the former element slightly predominating. It is very evident, therefore, that practically the same classes of people would be dealt with by lady rent-collectors in American and European cities.

The lowest division of social strata includes the drunkard, the incorrigible, the criminal, the immoral, the lazy and the shiftless. The habitations of such people we cannot dignify with the name of home, because not one of the virtues which make that name sacred is there either inculcated or practised. Houses to them are shields against observation, refuges from pursuit and shelters for infamy. Here crime is nurtured, and worst of all, the family relation prostituted to the perpetuation of the vicious and the low. Such people would best be rounded up in public lodging houses where they could be constantly under public, if not under police, supervision. It is perfectly possible to do this indirectly, by the stringent enforcement of sanitary law. These people are such destructive tenants that landlords simply cannot afford to harbor them.

If provision is made for family as well as individual lodging houses, the objection sometimes raised—an objection rather sentimental than real—that under no circumstances should families be separated, is overcome. Glasgow is on the eve of opening a family lodging house where widowers or widows with children will be received. Careful calculations indicate that it will be quite successful financially. Lodging houses have been more remunerative than any other of Glasgow's housing enterprises. We must look, then, largely to model lodging houses for individuals of both sexes and for partly disrupted families, as well as to the stringent enforcement of sanitary laws to help solve the problem of the lowest classes.

The limits of this paper are fixed within economic boundaries. Financial returns have of necessity claimed the most conspicuous attention. But a complete answer to the query, "Will improved housing pay?" must calculate profit of another sort. No phase of social neglect costs like unwholesome living environment. Within it lie disease, poverty, and wretched moral misery. Out of it come the criminal, the drunkard and ne'er-do-wells, preying upon society, it is true, but reminders, none the less, of unfulfilled obligations. No phase of extraneous amelioration is as potent as improved housing. The urgency of so paramount a social requirement calls for renewed and unrelenting effort, while the brightness of economic and ethical prospect invite to helpful co-operation and service.

E. R. L. Gould.

Johns Hopkins University.

PUBLICATIONS.

The following papers have appeared in the Publications of the Union. They may be had from the Secretary at ten cents each. Subscription, one dollar per annum.

SERIES A.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD.
Rev. R. A. Holland, S.T.D.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY IN RELATION TO THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH.
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D.

THE INCARNATION, A REVELATION OF HUMAN DUTIES.
Rt. Rev. B. F. Westcott, D.D.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
Joseph Mazzini.

WHAT THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION IS.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY FATHERS. (Two views.)
Revs. C. L. Marson and W. F. Cobb.

THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY IN THE CITY TO-DAY.
Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D.D.

PRESENT ASPECT OF THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION,
Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington.

SOCIALISM AND SPIRITUAL PROGRESS.
Miss Vida D. Scudder.

THE SPIRIT AND WORK OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS.
Rev. C. H. Brent.

SERIES B.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE OF 1894.
Prof. W. J. Ashley, M.A.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIME.
Prof. Henry C. Adams, Ph.D.

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.
Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND PRACTICAL LIFE.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

STRIKES.
Rev. Prof. W. Cunningham, D.D.

A PLAN OF WORK.

THE SLUMS OF GREAT CITIES AND THEIR PROBLEMS.
Rev. P. W. Sprague.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.
Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell.

LEGALITY AND PROPRIETY OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS. Suggestions by the Attorney General of the United States in Platt *v.* P. & R. R. R.

AMERICAN TRADE UNIONS.
Rev. W. D. P. Bliss.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION.

These Publications are issued under the auspices and with the general approval of the Executive Committee; but no responsibility is assumed by the Union for the particular views of individual writers. It is intended to provide for the expression of divergent opinions.

All letters should be addressed and all remittances made payable to

THE CHURCH SOCIAL UNION,
1 JOY STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 06571 378 4